

Num ber		Notes
704	Allee, Lisa (CCHCF)	SUBJECT: TEXT/COMMENTS: I am writing to STRONGLY oppose the permit for the Desert Rock Power plant as the proposal now stands. Another coal fired plant in the Four Corner's would be incredibly harmful for the air quality, which already suffers greatly from the two existing coal fired plants. I live in Chinle, Arizona and Mancos, Colorado and have worked in Shiprock. There are days when the smog in the Shiprock and Cortez areas (I look down at Cortez from my house and can see the smog coming up in the space between Mesa Verde and the Ute Mountain) reminds me of Phoenix and Los Angeles. The asthma rates in Shiprock and Farmington are already high enough and another coal plant would make them even higher! I would like to STRONGLY suggest that instead of a coal-fired plant the Navajo Nation and its financial partners should build a combination wind and solar powered plant. We have an abundance of both sun and wind in this area!! Please deny this permit and recommend that the proposal be changed to wind and solar instead of coal!! Be brave and do the right thing! Thank you for protecting our environment—now please do so!
705	Barry Rhea	SUBJECT: No permits should be issued or further agreements made with the proponents of this action until a full EIS has been prepared and reviewed by the public as require by NEPA. TEXT/COMMENTS: To whom it may concern: I am an environmental consultant and conduct NEPA analysis under contract to both public and private clients. I am mystified by this comment period that precedes the release of an EIS on this proposed action. Apparently these comments are not scoping comments because the EIS is already being prepared. The ramifications of the proposed action on the Four Corners region have the potential to highly detrimental to the health and quality of life for the population of the Four Corners. Even though this will be a high tech facility supposedly incorporating the highest technology in pollution control we have no idea what the cumulative effects this will have in the region. We have existing major polluters in the region (i.e., natural gas industry, Four Corners power plant, San Juan power plant, highway traffic) that are already compromising our air and water quality. Over the next twenty years gas wells in the region will more than double and population growth and associated development is projected increase substantially. This begs for an analysis of cumulative effects as is required by NEPA. An honest cost benefit analysis will show that the potential loss the regions tourism alone could far exceed the benefits of this speculative project which has not even identified its customers. It is apparent that they will not be residents of the Four Corners. The people of this region are incredulous at how this project is being pushed by the federal government. No permits should be issued or further agreements made with the proponents of this action until a full EIS has been prepared and reviewed by the public as require by NEPA. To do otherwise is to circumvent the basic laws created by Congress to protect the citizens of this land. Barry Rhea Rhea Environmental Consulting [REDACTED] Mancos, CO 81328 rhea@frontier.net
706	Charles & Frieda Blassingame	SUBJECT: FW: Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit TEXT/COMMENTS: Charles & Frieda Blassingame [REDACTED] La Plata, New Mexico, 87418 Nov. 4, 2006 Robert Baker Air-3 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 75 Hawthorne St. San Francisco, CA 94105 Subject: Desert Rock Power Plant Dear sir, We feel we have a moral obligation to respond to the PSD permit. San Juan County exports electricity to other states that do not allow the building of power plants due to air quality and building codes. Why should we be subjected to all the side effects of producing electricity for states

Number		Notes
		<p>that won't build power plants? Having lived in San Juan County since 1956, we have seen the air quality deteriorate from the two power plants we have in operation in the county. Another power plant would further deteriorate our already polluted air. Monday October 30, 2006 I was on the bluffs south of Farmington. The smog from the Four Corners Power Plant and PNM was clearly visible with a yellow streak drifting east along the San Juan River Valley. This is smog that the families in Farmington and other communities are subject to breathing because they live down wind from the power plants. Mercury emissions are a known by product from power plants. It is also a known fact that it is not safe to eat fish from Navajo Lake due to high levels of mercury in the fish. If Mercury is contaminating fish, what is it doing to all the crops at NAPI and San Juan County that enter the food chain? A plaque at Mesa Verde explains that before the power plants, you could see hundreds of miles to the south. That view is no longer, due to the smog the two power plants are emitting. We know that building another power plant would bring jobs and revenue into San Juan County. We also know that our health and quality of life is in jeopardy from breathing smog. Cancer already is a large problem in San Juan County. The Environmental Protection Agency was enacted to protect the United States. Frieda and I believe the EPA should be doing the duty it is charged with by not allowing Desert Rock Power Plant to further harm regional air quality. Thank you, Charlie and Frieda Blassingame</p>
707	David K. Primrose	<p>SUBJECT: air quality TEXT/COMMENTS: If the story I read in today's Durango Herald is correct, I wonder who is protecting us from pollutants, and why do we have an agency so willing to aggressively support another power plant in the Southwest. I have lived and owned property in the Durango and Cortez area for over 30 years. In the early 1970's I could clearly see the Shiprock geographic feature from the Four Corners Monument. Today, I can barely define the silhouette from that same location. In addition, your "expert", Colleen McKaughan, declares that the air in the locality is so clean it can easily absorb the pollutants from a new plant. Why do we want this clean air polluted? The article also states that mercury particles will be reduced by 70%. What is the baseline for this "reduction"? Please read the September 14 issue of the Durango Herald for methods private citizens are using to generate clean electricity. I am firmly against the building of this power plant. Please reply to the questions I have asked. Thank you. david primrose, masters elementary school, 6th grade</p>
708	David T. Walker	<p>SUBJECT: Notice desert Rock Meetings TEXT/COMMENTS: Who decided not to hold a public information meeting or hearing in Farmington? Why? I was told there would be a hearing in Durango on October 3rd. Is this correct? If so why wasn't it noticed along with the October 4 hearing in Shiprock? All the power plants have a degrading effect on everyone in the Farmington area. I am very interested in every aspect of EPA's decision not to have a public information meeting or public hearing there. For that matter it seems to me that there should be at least two public information meetings at each site, and I am specifically including Farmington in this request. It also appears to me that you published an incorrect email address in the paragraph of your notice captioned "Comments in Person".</p>
709	Dott, Cynthia	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant Permit TEXT/COMMENTS: To Whom it May Concern; I am writing to register my very strong opposition to the construction of the Desert Rock Power Plant. I fail to understand how the proposed power plant can be touted as a new, "clean" coal-burning plant, when it will be pumping more carbon dioxide into the atmosphere per year (13.7</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>million tons) than the existing San Juan Generating Station, which is rated as one of the dirtiest in the nation. Like it or not, all of the scientific evidence points to CO2 being a powerful greenhouse gas, and the more of it we release into the atmosphere the more we accelerate global climate change and warming. Based on all of the projections and climate models we can construct, the southwest looks like it will be hit very hard by the climate change we are inducing with our high rate of production of greenhouse gases. It therefore makes even less sense for we in this region to be adding even more carbon dioxide to the atmosphere. Desert Rock will wreak havoc on the already poor air quality of the Four Corners region. Farmington, NM already has ozone levels that are into the unacceptable range for federal health standards, and the Desert Rock proposal makes no concession to these existing problems: it will add even more ozone to the already polluted air of the Farmington & Four Corners area. The southwest is famous for its clear skies and incredible views, but increasingly these are disappearing, to be replaced by brown smog and haze from four corners coal-burning power plants - this is a disgraceful state of affairs. Already in our region we cannot eat fish from our reservoirs and rivers because they contain elevated levels of mercury. Where does this mercury come from? Most of it has been tracked to the area's coal-burning power plants, which make no attempts to remove heavy metals from either the coal or their emissions. Desert Rock also has shown no intentions of cleaning up its mercury emissions. In short, the Desert Rock Power Plant as planned is a dinosaur - if any new plant were to be constructed in the southwest, it must use state-of-the-art technology to reduce or eliminate CO2 emissions, clean up heavy metals, and stop the production of ozone. The technology is out there to do these things, and consumers are ready to support them; the government is being irresponsible in not pushing cleaner air quality standards. Alternatively, if energy conservation were a priority, the new power plant would not need to be built at all. EPA, it is time to take your head out of the sand. This is not a project we want or need or can environmentally or morally justify. Do not permit the Desert Rock Power Plant to be built. Sincerely, Cynthia Dott [REDACTED] Ave. Durango, CO 81301</p>
710	Farquhar, Ned	<p>SUBJECT: RE: Desert Rock comment letter TEXT/COMMENTS: Fantastic job by everybody. These are really good and comprehensive. Thanks to WCEC for coordinating and I am very glad NRDC was able to participate. Ned Farquhar Natural Resources Defense Council Mountain West energy/climate advocate office (505) 344-1020 or [REDACTED] nfarquhar@nrdc.org From: John Barth [mailto:jbarth@westernceec.org] Sent: Mon 11/13/2006 9:06 AM To: Bob Baker; desertrockairpermit@epa.gov Cc: Eric Frankowski; Mike Eisenfeld; Andy Bessler; Ben Luce; Brad Johnson; Doug Meiklejohn; George Hays; Jana Milford; Jeanne Bassett; John Fogarty; Lori Goodman; Mark Pearson; Matt Bishop; Farquhar, Ned; Nick Persampieri; Nicole Rosmarino; Rob Smith; Roger Clark; Tony Skrelunas; Vicki Stamper; Vickie Patton Subject: Desert Rock comment letter Bob Attached please find a comment letter on the draft air permit for the proposed Desert Rock submitted on behalf of a coalition of conservation organizations. Also attached is an index to attachments and expert reports submitted as part of the comment letter. I Fed Ex'ed to you on Friday November 10, 2006 a CD containing the comment letter, list of attachments, expert reports and all attachments. Please confirm that you received this email and the CD. If you have any questions, don't hesitate to contact me. John Barth Western Clean Energy Campaign 2260 Baseline Road, Suite 205 Boulder, CO 80302 (303) 440-5188 jbarth@westernceec.org</p>
711	Gaige,	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock PSD limit for Flourides TEXT/COMMENTS: Could you</p>

Number		Notes
	David	<p>please explain the logic of including Fluorides in the PSD evaluation for this project? It is my understanding that the fluoride emissions would all be in the form of hydrogen fluoride (HF) before being emitted, and it again is my understanding that HF is a listed HAP, and therefore exempt from PSD review. Thanks David Gaige Burns & McDonnell ()</p>
712	Gerry, Wayne	<p>SUBJECT: Power Plant environmental impact TEXT/COMMENTS: I deeply concerned about the air quality in the Four Corners region be further eroded by the addition of yet another power plant. I understand the need for economic development of the region, but feel the environmental damage would outweigh any benefit. I am an asthmatic as is my daughter. I moved to this region from Los Angeles to get away from smog and traffic congestion. I understand the prevailing wind pattern would bring much of the pollution from this plant directly to the Aztec area. Please reconsider the location of this plant. If more power is needed on the grid on the West Coast or in Las Vegas wouldn't it make more sense to build a plant closer to those needing the power. I do believe those who stand to benefit from the production of this plant, should also take on the burdens this plant causes. I urge you to deny this permit. Wayne Gerry. Aztec, NM 87410 NOTICE - This message and any attached files may contain information that is confidential and/or subject of legal privilege intended only for use by the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this message in error and that any dissemination, copying or use of this message or attachment is strictly forbidden, as is the disclosure of the information therein. If you have received this message in error please notify the sender immediately and delete the message.</p>
713	Jeff B. Davis	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Clean Air Act TEXT/COMMENTS: October 17, 2006 RE: Desert Rock Clean Air Act A third coal-fired energy plant proposed southwest of Shiprock, NM - the Deep Rock project proposed by Texas-based Sithe Global Power – should concern everyone living in our Four Corners region. This massive plant, with its two supercritical pulverized coal-fired boilers, will generate enough power to electrify 1 MILLION 200,000 METERS EVERY YEAR! Such power is said to be needed for Southwest growth (e.g., the glaring lights of Las Vegas?) Stephen Etcitty, executive director of the Navajo Nation Environmental Protection Agency, admits that this plant on the Nation would emit various pollutants: sulfur and nitrogen dioxides, carbon monoxide, lead, ozone and small particulate matter. His people already have abundant asthma and cancer concerns; and what about the rest of us? The EPA's Region 9 air-quality "expert", Colleen McKaughan, has said Four Corners air is so clean that it can absorb more pollutants. And at an early October hearing in Durango, she stood by her views saying that the two existing northwest New Mexico plants will improve their emissions. Has she been up on Mesa Verde and looked south to see the poisonous yellow haze which obscures Shiprock? Further, it's said our plants and animals are already contaminated. And the danger of mercury poisoning has not even been addressed. In a statement, Colorado Congressman John Salazar wrote: "Recent studies by the United State Geological Survey have confirmed that the most likely source of mercury contamination of water bodies in Colorado is from coal-fired plants in New Mexico. Given this fact, the release of more mercury into our air ... is of grave concern..." Must we take the promises of builder Sithe and the EPA on faith! (We've been misled before.) If, as Sithe promoter Frank Maisano urges, "There is a dramatic need for new power in this region" there is also a dramatic need for promises IN WRITING. Will new</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>pollution curbs be added to the two existing power plants? And will ironclad, state-of-the-art pollution controls be proposed, written into and included in the Deep Rock project? If the plant is ever constructed, the health of us all deserves nothing less. Sincerely, Jeff B. Davis [REDACTED], Durango, CO 81301</p>
714	Julie A. Cooley	<p>SUBJECT: cost can not be justified TEXT/COMMENTS: The proposed Desert Rock Coal fired power plant should not be approved. The potential savings that states such as CA and VT have received by implementing energy efficiency programs that actually reduced consumer utility bills and reduced carbon dioxide emissions vs.. the very likely higher costs to pay for the new power plant and the projected 13.7 million tons of added CO2 generated by the proposed Desert Rock Coal plant are evidence that this project is not needed and in fact will only increase costs – fiscally and environmentally. Please review the alternatives – Julie Cooley Mortgage Goddess [REDACTED] phone 970-382-5841 fax CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify fnbdurango.com and destroy all copies of the original message. 259 West 9th St. • P.O. Box 2910 • Durango, CO 81302-2910 • 970-247-3020 • Fax 970-247-8031 • www.fnbdurango.com</p>
715	Korb, Dr. Julie	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Permit Comments TEXT/COMMENTS: October 29, 2006 To Whom It May Concern: I am writing this letter to express my deep concern regarding the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant. As a mother, Biology college professor, and individual living in the Four Corners region, I see no reasoning for supporting this proposed Plant because of the severely negative impacts it would have on the air quality and environment in this region. Many of the individuals that live in the Four Corners region do so because of the quality of the environment. By permitting the Desert Rock Power Plant, you will be negating one of the main reasons we live in this beautiful area. In addition, we as a society need to look carefully at the choices we are making in regards to adding additional greenhouse gases into our atmosphere. The Desert Rock Power Plant specifically would increase Sox, CO2, NOx, and mercury emissions in this region. We already have major environmental and health issues with these emissions in our area and allowing this Plant to be built would only add to these problems. Specific questions the EPA needs to address regarding the Desert Rock Power Plant include the following: 1) how would it influence mercury levels in the area and mercury advisories already affecting area reservoirs such as Navajo and Vallecito; 2) how would it influence ozone limits in the Four Corners region; 3) how will it influence the visibility in the Weminuche Wilderness and Mesa Verde National Park; 4) how will it influence non-stationary air quality that will add to stationary air quality issues; and 5) how will it comply with Executive Order 12898 regarding environmental justice in minority and low-income populations? Finally, as a scientist, there are serious questions regarding the methodology used for air quality monitoring of the Desert Rock Power Plant. The EPA needs to include cumulative air quality impacts and needs to utilize more monitoring sites besides the two they used (Farmington and Rio Rancho, New Mexico) to provide the public with a comprehensive understanding of the full impacts this new plant will have on the air quality and health of the environment within the Four Corners Region. Sincerely, Dr. Julie E. Korb Assistant Professor Biology Department Fort Lewis College 1000 Rim Drive Durango, Colorado 81301 korb_j@fortlewis.edu</p>

Number		Notes
716	Nelson, Loren M (LMNELSON)	SUBJECT: Good job... TEXT/COMMENTS: Thank you for considering our individual voices and taking time to listen to all of our concerns. As you are fully aware, the plant poses serious problems to the surrounding public and environment. In the long run, the people will have to deal with a radically different quality of life. We can't keep building plant after plant to sustain our massive energy use because it will only lead to more chemicals in the air and angry people in the towns. We must find ways to reduce our use of energy and when we do, alternative energy will definitely pose a threat to more conventional energy production. That is why I am concerned about the coal-burning plant. Sure it will create jobs and energy, but for how long will it be before the economic, social, and natural environment starts to take a turn for the worse, and major changes take place? I must pose at least one more question: don't you want the better things in life? I know I do and that is the reason why people need more than just a desert rock project to keep us going in the short run. Thank you for listening to the people and I will continue to pray our people (all people), and the future will not have to live with the endangering consequences posed by building more coal burning plants.
717	Ruger, Dave	SUBJECT: Technical Comments on Draft Air Permit TEXT/COMMENTS: Dr. Mr. Baker: IX. C. v. – EPA Methods 201 and 201A should be added to the PM/PM10 Performance Tests. Method 202 is used to determine condensable PM, and be used in conjunction with Methods 201 or 201A. Please state for each hourly emission limit (24-hours or less) if it is a "block" or "hourly rolling" period. The distinction is important in implementing DAHS software for those parameters needing a CEMS. Best Regards, David W. Ruger, P.E. Manager, Regulatory Compliance Honeywell Environmental Center of Excellence 604 West Pinon St. Farmington, NM 87401 druger@honeywellpai.com 505-327-0250 fax 0256 cell 505-486-5842
718	Vickie Peck	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant approval TEXT/COMMENTS: To Whom It May Concern, Please note my strong objection to the recent EPA approval of the Desert Rock Power Plant on the Navajo Nation in Arizona. This plant should never be approved based on several points: 1- The use of 4500 acre-feet of water in an extremely water- scarce land is a matter of social justice given that the local Navajo people are often without indoor running water for toilets and bathing; 2- The pollution by mercury, SOx and NOx are serious environmental problems everywhere, particularly in this area due to two other coal fired plants in the close vicinity; and 3- We as a nation should not be investing in more of the worst kind of power generating facilities simply because coal is cheap. Global climate change is too serious to make these kinds of short term economic decisions. I strongly request that the EPA reconsider granting approval to build the Desert Rock Plant to Sithe Global Power, LLC. Sincerely, Vickie M. Peck [REDACTED] Placitas, NM 87043
719	Schooley, Alan L. (NNMC)	SUBJECT: Desert Rock permit TEXT/COMMENTS: As a physician working in the Four-Corners area I have noticed a large number of comments regarding air quality and its effect on San Juan County residents. Much too has been made about how clean the Desert Rock plant will be. First, it doesn't matter how clean the plant is, it will still add to the pollution in the area. Currently the American Lung Association rates the air quality in San Juan County as good. Additional air pollution no matter how clean the plant is will decrease the quality of the air not only in San Juan county but even more so in counties lying to the east. Additionally, the two plants currently producing power in San Juan county produce high amounts of mercury. Due to the rapid fall-out of mercury particles (typically less than 10 miles) citizens in San Juan and LaPlata County (in

Num ber		Notes
		Colorado) are heavily affected. Additional mercury added to the county environment will damage the local environment and put citizen safety at risk. This effect is magnified by the fact that the local citizenry will not benefit from the power produced by the new plant, but communities far from the effects will (i.e. Arizona and Nevada). This is not only a public health problem but a basic problem of fairness as well. Many alternative sources of energy can be utilized in this area including wind and solar, but none of these options were pursued before deciding on another coal fired plant. Wind power would need to be located farther south to utilize the best wind fields, but it is clean and far more appropriate for the area. The desert rock plant should not be given an operating permit. Even more so, the two plants currently operating should be given mandatory pollution reduction orders. Thanks. Alan L. Schooley, MD
720	Shash, Tomas I. (TISHASH)	SUBJECT: TEXT/COMMENTS: I'm a student at Fort Lewis College and I oppose the Desert Rock plant. Further destruction of our ecosystems, as well as the indigenous peoples that live there, is not acceptable.
721	Shock, Brian	SUBJECT: New Power plant TEXT/COMMENTS: To Whom It May Concern: I am writing this email in opposition to the building of new power plants in the four corners area. We already have 1 power plant, that is enough. This power plant already affects people with respiratory issues, fish in Navajo Lake, air quality and so on. I am concerned about the location of the Desert Rock power plant, the winds blow from southwest to northeast. Farmington, Aztec, Bloomfield will be affected by the traditional wind patterns. We do not need anymore air pollution. In summary, I oppose the building of the Desert Rock power plant 25 miles southwest of Shiprock, NM. Thank you for your time and consideration, Sincerely, Brian Shock NOTICE - This message and any attached files may contain information that is confidential and/or subject of legal privilege intended only for use by the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this message in error and that any dissemination, copying or use of this message or attachment is strictly forbidden, as is the disclosure of the information therein. If you have received this message in error please notify the sender immediately and delete the message.
722	Stephanie (Taffy) Johnson	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Clean Air Act permit TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear EPA officials, I am commenting on the proposed permit for Sithe Global and the Desert Rock Clean Air permit. Please do not approve the permit for the Desert Rock power plant. To risk the health of the citizens that live in the 4 Corners region, for the profit of such a powerful corporation is unacceptable and unforgiveable. This power plant is not the way to go. Too many of us do cannot even afford health insurance, yet our lives are put at risk for the profit of a few. The propaganda we've been given does not alleviate the extra mercury contamination and the consequences that we will pay for Sithe's profit. I sincerely hope that someone in our government remembers that serving citizens' health is more important than serving corporations' profits. I understand that new technology, such as the coal gasification in North Dakota is promising. We also need to develop sustainable sources that do not affect our health and global climate. We have left too many problems for our children already. Please say "NO" to Sithe Global and show us that government does not work only for corporations and their profit, but for the good of us all. Sincerely, Stephanie Johnson [REDACTED], Co. 81301 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
723	Wright,	SUBJECT: Coal/ power plant TEXT/COMMENTS: The Farmington population

Num ber		Notes
	Dan	is growing rapidly. We already have the toxic air from diesel and other gases. While it's true we may need a power plant, coal emissions would further pollute our already polluted air. Please locate a different area and try to power up from a cleaner source. Thank you, Dan Wright Aztec high school NOTICE - This message and any attached files may contain information that is confidential and/or subject of legal privilege intended only for use by the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this message in error and that any dissemination, copying or use of this message or attachment is strictly forbidden, as is the disclosure of the information therein. If you have received this message in error please notify the sender immediately and delete the message.
724	Yarbrough, Lindsay	SUBJECT: TEXT/COMMENTS: I hope it isn't too late to get in my thought on the proposed power plant. Having grown up in the area I have noticed the pollution in the air and know it is coming from the numerous power plants already in existance. I think adding another short changes all the future generations. Who will take care of the increased medical costs associated with all the lung problems it can cause? I know it certainly won't be the company who will make all the money or their shareholders. I have had asthma and notice increased problems when there is increased haze in the area. I like all the way in Durango and can see the haze everyday. It is not fair for us to put profit over people. How about we fix all the old ones and put in some solar power??? We have to think of future generations...not future profit. The jobs it may create will not compensate for the decresed quality of life for all those living near the plants. And the power doesn't even stay in the area it goes to big cities so we smaller areas get the brunt of the effects. It seems to me it is just easier for companies to prey on the poor such as the case for this new plant because we do need jobs and already have the pollution to deal with. Thank you for considering my thoughts...I am sure it will have little effect due to the fact that corporations have more weight that real people. Lindsay Yarbrough
725	Albert Bockhahn	SUBJECT: Air quality problems of the proposed Desert Rock Energy Facility TEXT/COMMENTS: To Whom It May Concern: The permit for this facility should be denied due to the obvious air quality concerns that this plant will generate. The people of the Four Corners area have had to endure two (2) previous power plants and the decrease in air quality that they have brought . We do not need or want another. When will the powers to be realize that the trade off of pollution and subsequent decrease in the quality of our lives and that of future generations for short term profit is not the path that we need to take in addressing our energy problems. This country (USA) consumes the most energy and has the worst record of pollution on this planet. It is time to wake up and realize that our planet is a living system and it is being changed beyond repair by the greed of thoughtless profiteering. PLEASE, THIS PERMIT MUST BE DENIED. Thank you. Al Bockhahn Ignacio, Co.
726	Alex Prime	SUBJECT: Desert Rock- concerned citizen TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear EPA: I am writing as a concerned citizen to express my concern over the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant that Sithe plans to build in San Juan County, New Mexico, on the Navajo Reservation. As proposed, Desert Rock would be the third coal-fired power plant concentrated in the Four Corners region. Local communities already suffer from poor air quality, ozone problems, and high rates of illnesses that can be correlated to leukemia and asthma. Why is the EPA allowing the high concentration of power plants in the Four Corners region

Number		Notes
		<p>degrading public health and quality of life. My suspicion is that this is a case of environmental racism. Since most of the residents of San Juan county, New Mexico are either Navajo or Hispanic, living below national poverty levels, they fall easy prey to such corporate abuses. Ultimately, they will be the ones to suffer the ill effects of pollution from these coal fired energy plants. Given the growing consensus about global warming caused by carbon dioxideemissions, and the likelihood that carbon dioxide will be regulated in the near future, how can the EPA ignore the vast contribution to global warming caused by Desert Rock? I strongly urge the EPA to reconsider Permitting Desert Rock Power Plant to be approved. Alex Prime Alexandra Prime Cultural Explorations Program Coordinator Crow Canyon Archaeological Center 23390 Road K Cortez CO, 81321 (970)564-4356 Phone (970)564-4383 Fax</p>
727	Alexia Hudson	<p>SUBJECT: Air Quality Comments TEXT/COMMENTS: To Whom It Concerns: As a mother of young children and the daughter, niece, cousin and grandchild of those down river and down wind from this proposed power plant, I implore you to not approve the Four Corners power plant. The amount of haze in our area is reminiscent of a metropolitan area as it is. On a clear day you can see the brown haze over Shiprock, if you can see the Shiprock at all from as far north as HWY 184 in Colorado. From Hwy 550 (coming from CUba, NM) you can see the haze spreading all along the valley from Farmington down into northern Arizona. This haze is from the current power plants. Allowing another power plant in our area would be a gross negligence. I do not believe that our current power plants are repectful to the people downwind and river. Only time can tell what hazards lay ahead for posterity. The EPA website lists associated risks and possible connections with cancers associated with the existing powerplants. Too many people have already paid with their lives because these power plants do not follow clean air guidelines! Why would anyone even consider further jeopardising our already poor air quality. We live in the four corners because it is primarily a rural area, air qulaity should be the least of our concerns. Respectfully Submitted, Alexia Hudson [REDACTED] Cortez,CO 81321 970-564-1383 Get today's hot entertainment gossip http://movies.msn.com/movies/hotgossip?icid=T002MSN03A07001</p>
728	Aline Schwob	<p>SUBJECT: Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Sirs, I would like to go on record as being against the building of a new coal powered power plant with outdated technology. Since we in the Four Corners and beyond will be breathing the air from this thing for years to come, it would behoove us to build the cleanest possible plant using a coal gasification process. This will conserve coal and protect our precious environment. Our grandchildren will thank us. Thank you for your careful consideration in this matter. Aline C. Schwob</p>
729	Angi Sauk	<p>SUBJECT: TEXT/COMMENTS: To whom it may concern, I am writing from Cortez, Colorado regarding our quality of air. I have lived here for 10 years and prior to that in Shiprock, NM for 3 years. During the 10 years in Cortez, my view of the Chorizo mountains, Shiprock and at times the Ute Mountain have become more limited to non existing. When my husband and I moved here we could clearly see many of these views. When visiting Mesa Verde and seeing the historical change post power plants, it makes me ill. I am truly appalled that the Navajo Nation and the Federal government would even consider another power plant in this area. Our Four Corners community does not benefit from this type of "business" we are polluting our air and hurting our quality of life for electricity that we don't even use. Even if the power plants supplied this area I would be greatly concerned about the decline in air quality. I stand firmly against this project – we live here for the beauty and simple way of life. If</p>

Num ber		Notes
		Phoenix or Las Vegas or California need more power maybe they should consider planning for their growth and limiting it so our quality of life doesn't need to be drained. Maybe they and our government should be spending my tax dollars on alternative forms of electricity – we are in the perfect place to use solar power. The desert wasn't meant to house millions of people, just because they need air conditioning and power to run all the new developments being built doesn't mean I should have to suffer nor my 9 week old son. Thank you for your time, Angi Sauk Cortez, Colorado
730	Anne Jensen	SUBJECT: Desert rock comments TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Mr. Baker, My name is Robert Steele. I own a business in Durango,Co. And have lived here for 18 yrs. I don't have time for letters and don't much care for the computer,but, I have something to say about the proposed Desert Rock power plant. I find it just outrageous that theres talk of another coal-fired plant in our area. We already live (choke) with two of the dirtiest plants . The haze these two plants produce cover our area as well as pristine wilderness areas and archaeological sites. What they've done to the view at the Grand Canyon is shameful. I also think it's shameful that Sithe Global Power would choose to put another power plant on the Navajo Res. The tribe and many members are poor and are'nt as apt to oppose it. We, in the Four corners are already a national sacrifice area for the natural gas in our area.There are 10,000 new gas wells proposed for the area. Our air quality may not be too bad yet, but it's going to get much worse with all the drilling and compressors. Our mercury levels here are too high as it is. There may be a need for more energy but this is not the place for it. If Las Vegas needs more power build it there. Same with Phoenix. The Four Corners Can't handle any more. Sincerely, Robert Steele
731	Arnold Ronnebeck & Elizabeth Paak	SUBJECT: No permit TEXT/COMMENTS: EPA, We are writing to register our NO on giving a permit to the desert rock power plant. We have heard that the EPA is reducing or has already reduced its standards on clean air. Would this power plant be permissable on stricter regulations? Probably not. They are NOT using state of the art technologies to reduce the emissions, which are now available and we have heard would cost about 10% more. But the monies that be behind the plant don't want to spend that money. This is a power plant that is being built on the Navajo nation, which, we are assuming has more lax rules and regs than other areas, and there fore is easier to "force' its way in. We, the people in the 4 corners area do NOT need this plant, and do NOT want this plant. Please do not allow them to have a permit to build. The plant will also give off mercury, which is showing itself, along with other pollutants, in the streams and lakes all over the 4 corner area. There are already health warnings against eating the fish that come from those lakes, as far away as Vallecito Lake (about 100 miles away). Show that you have concern for people and not just for making money for a group of bankers and say NO. Sincerely, Lissa Paak Elizabeth Paak Gordon Henriksen Arnold Ronnebeck Lia Henriksen Kai Henriksen
732	Bruce Cressman	SUBJECT: desert rock power plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear sir; I am writing this from nearby Durango. The EPA has minimized the impact of this proposed plant upon this area, especially with regard to mercury contamination and has presented a very glossed over impression that we won't be affected all that much. This notwithstanding the recent findings at Lake Vallecito. Please send Stithe back to the drawing board for cleaner technology or can the whole thing. Bruce Cressman Check Out the new free AIM(R) Mail -- 2 GB of storage and industry-leading spam and email virus protection.
733	Ben	SUBJECT: deny desert rock permit TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Mr. Baker:

Num ber		Notes
	Hawes	Please deny this permit. It will increase mercury levels in my county and further deteriorate the already worsening air for electricity we don't even use. This plant will harm my and y children's health, and must be stopped. Thank you. - Ben Hawes [REDACTED] Mancos, CO 81328
734	Beth Wheeler	SUBJECT: comments -new power plant TEXT/COMMENTS: October 25, 2006 To Whom It May Concern: I am writing in opposition to the proposed Desert Rock power plant. In the last seven years I have driven from my home in Mancos to my job in Shiprock, NM via Cortez. There always is a yellowish-brown haze hanging in the air above Shiprock. Some days are worse than others, but the haze is ALWAYS there. This haze sometimes blows up this corridor to the Cortez area, as well. I also visit Mesa Verde National Park quite frequently, and it is a rare day when I can see the Shiprock formation clearly. Some days I can just barely make it out. I don't see how you can allow even a little more pollution to degrade the beautiful vistas at Mesa Verde and the Weminuche Wilderness, both Class 1 areas. Our area CANNOT handle any more pollution! I suggest making the existing power plants clean up before even considering building another one. Economic development is a poor excuse for polluting our air and degrading the health of everyone and everything that lives in this area. Sincerely, Elizabeth M. Wheeler [REDACTED] Mancos, CO 81328 [REDACTED]
735	Beverly Ellis	SUBJECT: please DO NOT issue a permit TEXT/COMMENTS: I am NOT in favor of the proposed coal plant at Desert Rock in NM. I am of the belief that the negative environmental impact and cost will not be offset by the power generated. Other states through implementation of energy efficiency programs have not only reduced consumer utility bills, but have also the carbon dioxide emissions generated by these types of coal plants. States such as CA and VT have employed energy consultants to research energy efficiency programs that have not only off-set the cost of those programs, but generated utility savings and reduction of pollution. It is my understanding that a projected 13.7 million tons of added CO2 will be generated by the proposed Desert Rock Coal plant in NM. This is unacceptable and I urge you NOT to issue a permit and to encourage NM to hire energy consultants, if you need one I can recommend one. Thank you. Beverly Ellis
736	Bill and Jill Tripp	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Air Permit TEXT/COMMENTS: To Whom It May Concern, October 27, 2006 I am writing to you to request you deny the Clean Air Act permit for the proposed Desert Rock Energy Project. A permit should not be approved prior to the release of a completed environmental impact statement. Northwest New Mexico and Southwest Colorado face air quality challenges currently, without a new source of emissions. The cumulative impact of Desert Rock, along with the two other coal-burning power plants in northern New Mexico (among the nation's most polluting plants) must be addressed. This area also has unregulated pollution from thousands of gas wells. Air quality degradation causes health problems, and can affect our tourist-based economy. On many days there is a brown haze over Farmington, and Shiprock is not even visible from Farmington. Fish consumption advisories have been posted at Vallecito, Navajo, McPhee, and other area reservoirs due to high mercury levels. The movement of the air does not respect state boundary lines, so although Colorado is in Region 8, not in Region 9, we in Colorado are also concerned about what happens to our neighbor New Mexico, and urge denial of the Clean Air Act permit for Desert Rock. Sincerely, Jill M. Tripp [REDACTED] Durango Co 81302
737	Bill Carver	SUBJECT: desert rock comment TEXT/COMMENTS: To Robert Baker Hi, I

Number		Notes
		<p>would like to voice my concerns against the proposed desert rock plant. Having lived in the four corners area for over 20 years, and being a frequent visitor to the Ship Rock and Grand Canyon areas, I have noticed a marked decrease in the air quality in the Four Corners area. Over those 20 years, there has been a noticeable increase in the haze, and a corresponding decrease in the visibility within our region. I believe that this plant must not be built as proposed, and I believe it is the EPA's responsibility to safeguard the environment from this proposed plant. With global warming a real hazard, the increase in mercury levels in our environment, and no real push for conservation of energy within our national energy policy, this plant is the wrong idea at the wrong time. Add to the mix the absolutely ridiculous comment from Colleen McKaughan of the EPA that our air is clean enough to absorb more pollution without harm shows a clear bias that has no place within an organization whose mission is to protect the environment. It is not the EPA's job to get in bed with those that wish to pollute the environment. I am asking the EPA to do it's job, and act in a manner consistent with a long term energy policy that does not ruin our local environment. Regards, Bill Carver Durango, CO</p>
738	Bill Kaul	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock TEXT/COMMENTS: Sir or Madam: PLEASE--no more discharge of ANY pollutants into the air of the Four Corners region. The valley is already filled with a noxious brown haze apparent to anyone looking down into it from above. A trip up to Farview in Mesa Verde or up to Beclabito will confirm this; walk up and look down into the murk; no expensive studies are needed. Check out the stats on respiratory and other pollutant-enhanced illness in this region. Therefore, NO to another coal-fired power plant, not matter how wonderfully "clean" and "modern" it is. B. Kaul Waterflow, NM Do you Yahoo!? Everyone is raving about the all-new Yahoo! Mail.</p>
739	Bill Palko-Schraa	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power plant / health risks TEXT/COMMENTS: To Whom It May Concern: I am a board certified physician who now encounters environmental toxicity problems on a daily basis. With this growing experience, I sought and received additional training in heavy metal toxicity from the American Board of Clinical Metal Toxicology. I commonly encounter adults and children with chronic mercury toxicity. Unfortunately this very prevalent medical problem that causes serious functional impairment and exacts huge financial costs from our community is not yet even part of the national conversation on mercury problems because so few physicians are trained in detection and treatment. The data we do have on mercury toxicity is huge but relies on blood levels and hair analysis both methods miss detection of large total body loads of mercury in a chronic state. In our own community we already have proven mercury toxicity of fish in local streams and reservoirs. Atmospheric and particulate distribution data (e.g. from Mesa Verde National Park) prove that our area is already perhaps the 2nd most mercury contaminated region in the US. This will be proven to be due to the fallout of pollutants from the existing coal fired power plant in our area. In my practice I encounter individuals testing positive for high chronic mercury loads who have cognitive and memory dysfunction, depression, fatigue, autoimmune disease, and endocrine disorders that clearly relate to the mercury toxicity (because they improve when they receive appropriate treatment). If the EPA gives a permit to the Desert Rock Power Plant for coal burning it will be clear that it does so with flagrant disregard for the health of the citizens of the Four Corners Area. Politics and economic lobbying aside, I hope to see the EPA actually step up to its "protection of the public welfare" responsibility in this issue. The Desert Rock Power Plant plan and permit should be unequivocally denied. Thank you Bill Palk-Schraa, D.O. Certified Physician, American Board of Clinical Metal</p>

Number		Notes
		Toxicology Board Certified, Family Medicine
740	Bob Thompson	<p>SUBJECT: DESERT ROCK COMMENTS TEXT/COMMENTS: I would like to comment on the proposed Desert Rock Clean Air Act permit. The NEPA requires that the cleanest technology (BACT) be utilized for new coal-fired power plants. According to the EPA's own studies (EPA-430/R-06/006 July 2006 U.S. EPA IGCC/Pulverized Coal Environmental Footprints and Cost Comparison), which compared the performance of pulverized coal (PC) and IGCC plants, it was found that IGCC emissions are less than for PC plants for all air pollutants, that IGCC plants generate less solid waste, and result in lower water use. It also found that, while IGCC capital costs are higher, operating costs for IGCC plants are lower. Finally, if CO2 capture and sequestration are required, the IGCC plant can do this at significantly lower costs than a PC plant. Obviously, IGCC is the Best Available Control Technology (BACT) and should be utilized. As the current Desert Rock design is not IGCC, I petition you to reject this permit, as it would allow higher pollution emissions and violate federal law.... Which is counter to your "supposed" intended goal. At the same time, I find the entire current EPA licensing process to be severely flawed. In 1997 the EPA determined that "of all the pollutants mentioned in the Clean Air Act mercury has the greatest potential to impact human health." Yet in 2006 mercury is now not even listed as a "criteria air pollutant" by the EPA, and is not covered during the design permitting process. As an American, I am embarrassed at how convoluted EPA's environmental protection process has become. The EPA's intended goal is protecting the health of Americans, NOT promoting pollution, nor promoting power plants. California is the major electricity consumer in America, and that state has opted to purchase power ONLY from the least polluting sources. Due to it's current design, the Desert Rock electricity could not be purchased by the biggest player in the field. Regardless of what EPA data indicates, southwest Colorado's air is already terribly degraded and polluted... way too much.... As can be seen in the hazy mountain views, mercury contaminated rain being recorded at Mesa Verde National Park, and the mercury contaminated fish signs posted at numerous southwestern Colorado lakes. DO NOT allow this project to go forward as presently designed. If it were to be redesigned as IGCC I would not object to its moving forward. Respectfully submitted, Bob Thompson Vallecito Valley, Colorado</p> <p>No virus found in this outgoing message. Checked by AVG Free Edition. Version: 7.1.408 / Virus Database: 268.13.9/490 - Release Date: 10/20/06</p>
741	Bradley Angel	<p>SUBJECT: Request for extension of public comment period and comments for the record TEXT/COMMENTS: On behalf of our constituents from the Navajo Nation, Greenaction requests an extension of the public comment period on the proposed Desert Rock power plant. On September 12, 2006 I received in the mail from US EPA the public notice for the EPA meeting to be held that night and this week. While I had received some earlier information from EPA, I was unsure if that earlier schedule had changed as I had been told it might. In addition, due to the challenges with communication on the reservation including language, an additional 60-90 days for public comment would be appropriate. We also understand that residents are requesting an additional public hearing be held in Farmington, New Mexico, and we endorse that request to maximize public participation. I also was alarmed to learn that on September 12th an EPA official apparently told a tribal member to shut up and took the microphone from her when she started addressing the combined impacts of the proposed power plant with the strip mine that would be an integral part of the project. EPA's action in attempting to silence a member of</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>the public who was not being disruptive is unacceptable and a violation of environmental justice. We believe that US EPA does not want the public to realize that the power plant proposal is actually bigger than your draft permit admits: a massive strip mine that would completely destroy the adjacent area, add air pollution, result in eviction of Navajo families including elders, and desecrate burials and an ancient village in the immediate vicinity. These impacts must be evaluated in your permit process. We no longer believe EPA is serious about environmental justice or trust responsibility: Issuance of a draft permit to add a coal-fired power plant to an area that already is heavily polluted, has lots of asthma among residents, already had two coal-fired power plants in the immediate vicinity, and would have additional impacts including eviction and destruction of an entire area is unacceptable, improper and illegal.</p>
742	Bruce Polich	<p>SUBJECT: don;t build the plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Citizens: Please do not build the proposed desert rock plant near Farmington! Those who live here have seen the pollution grown steadily over the past 20 years and our lives and health are affected on a daily basis. The proposed plant is a supersized polluter and dangerous to all living creatures in its spewing path--particularly the mercury emmissions. Your objective, informed judgment concerns the lives of human beings who are just like you in their desire to live quiet lives in a non-poisonous atmosphere.. Vote against this project. A plea for sane decisions, Bruce & Em Polich</p>
743	Buck Skillen	<p>SUBJECT: Comments on Desert Rock Power Plant. TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Robert Baker: I live in Durango, CO and as such will be directly downwind of the proposed power plant. Bottom line is I am against the construction and operation of this power plant. We are and have been suffering from two of the dirtiest coal fired plants in the US located near Shiprock, NM. We don't need another plant contributing to the degraded air and the build up of mercury contaminants in our area rivers and lakes, not to mention our air that we breathe. DO NOT PERMIT THIS COAL FIRED PLANT TO BE BUILT! Respectfully submitted; Frank Skillen, [REDACTED], Durango, CO 81301.</p>
744	Caleb Gates	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant: Health risks TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Robert Baker and the Environmental Protection Agency, I am asking you to acknowledge the existing mercury levels in the four corners region that exist in our waters and soil as evidenced by Atmospheric and particulate distribution data from measurements at Mesa Verde National Park which state that this region is perhaps the 2nd most mercury contaminated in the U.S.and the proven mercury toxicity of fish in local streams and reservoirs. Mercury is dangerous to our health and is stored in our tissues. I do not want to see Mercury levels increase in our four corners region. I look to the EPA to decrease the existing mercury levels and protect the scenic air quality that is steadily being degraded by coal production and other sources. It is in the interest of the citizens of the Untied States to see cleaner air and have cleaner energy sources such as wind power. This is an issue that will affect our future generations and the health of the environment for ions if it is not cleaned up and improved. I am an Oriental Medicine practitioner and former fly fishing guide. I see high levels of mercury and heavy metals as measured in peoples urine levels with a provoked urine test. The health costs to people and loss of vitality will continue to increase if coal plant production increases and air quality is not improved. Please deny this air permit or impose a standard on coal power plants and that will improve our current air quality especially with regards to mercury and heavy metals in our air. Maybe some old heavily</p>

Num ber		Notes
		polluting plants need to be taken out of production. Thank you Caleb Gates L.Ac.
745	carol millener	SUBJECT: desert rock TEXT/COMMENTS: I can't believe that there is a plan to put another air polluting plant in this region, especially since the current one is one of the most polluting plants in the country! First the old power plant should have to be cleaned up before even considering building another one. I treasure our clean air and blue skies and resent those who would endanger them. Sincerely, Carol Millener Durango, Co.
746	Caroline and Mac Johnson	SUBJECT: desert rock TEXT/COMMENTS: I am writing to express my great concern over the desert rock coal plant planned for the Farmington, New Mexico area. The four corners area already has some of the worst air quality for a rural area in the entire country! We see effects from the Four Corners Power Plant emissions in our air, our rivers and lakes and in the erosion of artifacts in our beautiful Mesa Verde National Monument. It is absolutely amazing to me that the epa would even consider allowing another coal fire plant in our area. The fish in our reservoirs already exhibit levels of mercury that make them unhealthy to eat. The residents of the Four Corners Area are very concerned with health issues, air quality issues and global warming issues. Please address all the emissions including mercury and CO2, and do not allow this plant to be built. Caroline Johnson Durango, Colorado
747	Carolyn Hoff	SUBJECT: Comment on proposed coal-burning power plant TEXT/COMMENTS: October 27, 2006 Dear EPA, Seldom have I ever commented on environmental issues, for you seem to be doing a great deal to help protect our land. However, this time I must speak out. I am a former biologist with the EPA in Las Vegas, Nevada, many years ago. While there I even took a seminar class about plume dispersal, regarding the Four Corners Power Plant. It never seemed to me that the plant might really change the air quality significantly. I currently live in the Four Corners area, since 1993. Now I see the change in air quality. Of course not only the Four Corners plant, but also the San Juan Power plant, have contributed much emmision into the atmosphere. Unfortunately, there is an obvious effect on the quality of our air and the great beauty of the landscape. From my work sites in Mesa Verde National Park for these past two summers I can also see the reduction in visibility of Shiprock in New Mexico. Surely, there are other not so obvious effects on the plant, animal, and human lives of resident life forms. Air quality IS a concern for both the present and the future. I agree with many that wise use of our resources is necessary. This area also needs more industry and employment. But, when you approve of the environmental impact statement for the Desert Rock Power Plant, PLEASE, put in the maximum requirements for protection from emmisions and pollution of any kind. Not only is construction the most effective time to install the protective devices, such as scrubbers, but the most economical, for in the future it is only going to be more expensive. Do not let us live to regret the failure to protect our future. Thank you for listening, Carolyn L. Hoff [REDACTED] Get your own web address for just \$1.99/1st yr. We'll help. Yahoo! Small Business.
748	Caye Geer	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Coal Burning Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: To all concerned EPA officials: I have read about the Desert Rock plan and attended the September 14 informational meeting at Ft. Lewis College, Durango. My main impression at that meeting was that the San Francisco EPA presenters had already made up their minds and are strongly in favor of this project as planned---in advance of final EIS studies and public input. I felt that questions about mercury, ozone, carbon dioxide got brushed off. We got a snow job. It is

Number		Notes
		<p>my understanding that the proposed technology is not, in fact, the cleanest available. I question why that would be and why the EPA would not require the cleanest possible technology. I am also concerned and amazed that there is poor coordination between the San Francisco and the Dallas EPA offices. I understand that the Dallas office has been working for years on the ozone problems which are degrading the air in Northern New Mexico. This compartmentalization seems to be working against the greater good. Considering the detrimental effects of the existing San Juan Generating Station---despite a lot of lip service--we have learned that we cannot trust that these power plants will continue to maintain equipment for optimal performance from a clean air standpoint. I look to the EPA for enforcement of higher standards. We the public want firm assurances that the advertised relatively low emissions will not be allowed to deteriorate over time. Our air quality in the entire Southwest region has suffered. This cannot really be separated from the entire nation's or the whole world's air quality now that global warming is widely accepted as a dire consequence for all of us. 2006 is no time to be adding massive amounts of pollutants to the atmosphere. Sincerely, Caye D. Geer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Dr. Durango CO 81301</p>
749	Charles Haley	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: I am a long-term resident of Montezuma County in southwest Colorado. In the 1960's when I was taking my three children to view the ruins in Mesa Verde National Park, we would try to see who would spot Shiprock in New Mexico when we rounded a favorite curve. Over the years I have witnessed the pollution from the two power plants out of Farmington, NM increase until it is not a matter of when we can spot Shiprock, but if. There are times it is not visible. Please hold power plants to the regulations and clean up the pollution--for me and for future generations Marilyn Haley Cortez, CO</p>
750	charlotte deters	<p>SUBJECT: EPA Draft Air Quality Permit TEXT/COMMENTS: I want to register my firm opposition to the issuance of an air quality permit by the EPA for the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant project. I oppose the EPA giving a permit for this project for the following reasons and ask the following questions: 1) The EPA is not considering the cumulative effect of air pollution from the addition of another coal fired plant in the same region as two existing power plants, known to be two of the worst polluting power plants in the nation. There is already a visible haze in the air from pollution from these power plants. 2) Mercury emissions are already high enough to have issued health advisories for water bodies in this region. How does the EPA plan on complying with the Clean Air Mercury Rule to permanently limit and reduce mercury emissions? 3) How can the EPA issue a draft air quality permit before release of the DEIS and the full analysis of that data? 4) Has the effect of Desert Rock on ozone levels in the Four Corners region been fully analyzed? 5) Has the effect of an additional power plant been considered on Class I areas such as Mesa Verde and the Weiminuche Wilderness area? How has this been studied? 6) This project is touted as using the cleanest technology available. Why is IGCC not being considered? 7) Where will the power generated by the proposed project be transmitted and what will be the air quality impacts of transmission. We in the Four Corners area are fortunate to live in a beautiful and relatively pristine area. We are obligated to entrust our air quality to the EPA to fully evaluate impacts of this proposed project. In this role the EPA is a steward of the earth and I sincerely hope that the responsibility will be taken in that light and that all impacts will be evaluated carefully with the utmost consideration. Sincerely, Charlotte Deters [REDACTED] Durango, Co. 81301 Do You Yahoo!? Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around</p>

Number		Notes
		http://mail.yahoo.com
751	Chris Foran	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Proposal Comments TEXT/COMMENTS: Mr. Baker, I am concerned about the proposed Desert Rock Coal Fired Power Plant for the following reasons. 1. There is very little monitoring of air quality in southwestern Colorado and the Four Corners in general. How can we know what the environmental impact of an additional coal fired power plant is without baseline data? The monitoring on Mesa Verde cannot be assumed to represent the entire area. 2. No federal official should make a decision of such importance to residents of the Four Corners without allowing us to read the draft Environmental Impact Statement. 3. The proposed PSD permit, if finalized through approval by the EPA, will allow the German Company, Sithe Global Energy, to construct two supercritical pulverized coal fired boilers and not require Sithe to utilize the Best Available Control Technology. That technology has been proven to be Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC). IGCC should certainly be included as an alternative to a pulverized coal fired boiler at Desert Rock. Not to include IGCC demonstrates that EPA is not interested in protecting the citizens of this area. 4. The Desert Rock facility proposal is the same basic technology that the U.S. power companies have been using since the 1950s, which produces mercury pollution, sulfates and nitrates, atmospheric carbon dioxide, and acid rain: awful stuff at higher altitudes especially. 5. For an EPA official to make a statement that the area has no pollution problem demonstrates a lack of awareness of the pollution that certainly does exist in the Four Corner's area. Having observed the cloud of tan goop that hung low in the sky at nine in the morning, October 24, 2006, I can attest that the area does indeed have a pollution problem. 6. I live at seven thousand feet altitude and can not tolerate the level of pollution that I did when I lived at less than a thousand feet. 7. In public meetings (2005) on behalf of Sithe's Desert Rock project, there was a promise of 90 percent reduction in mercury emissions, but since then Sithe has reneged on their mercury commitment in the PSD permit provisions. 8. Since California is targeted as a major power distribution market for Desert Rock, and since the State of California, by law, can no longer purchase electric power from plants that do not meet California standards, it behooves Sithe to ensure that Desert Rock be as clean as possible in its emissions. 9. The modeling results in the impact report are suspect because of the lack of monitoring stations at lower elevations, including agricultural lands and water resources. 10. The modeling does no take into account that the majority of people in the area are breathing air at six to seven thousand feet. 11. Nor does the modeling take into account the pollution that the various wells in the San Juan Basin are exuding. 12. Approval of the proposed PSD permit and construction of the Desert Rock facility will adversely affect visibility in the Four Corners. 13. The visibility of the air over the Montezuma and Mancos Valleys and the clarity of the air to the south looking over the Navajo and Ute Mountain Ute lands is deteriorating. Unless there is zero pollution from the Desert Rock Facility, there will be further deterioration in visibility. This fact is ignored in EPA's Ambient Air Quality Impact Report. Is the EPA going to allow a German Company, used to European air quality standards, to determine the amount of pollution of the Four Corner's area? I support The League of Women Voters of Cortez Montezuma County in asking that the EPA take the following actions: 1. Postpone action on the PSD until stakeholders can review and comment on the Environmental impact statement; 2. Require Sithe to fulfill its promise to reduce mercury emissions by 90 percent; 3. Examine other data and models for regional ambient air quality, including those available from the National Park</p>

Number		Notes
		Service Air Resources Division, especially in Class One areas; 4. Require Sithe to use the Best Available Control Technology, which is an Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle design; and 5. Require Sithe to provide additional monitoring stations in the Four Corners to assure Desert Rock complies with its permit conditions. I ask EPA to question the absurdity of the Four Corners area generating electricity for California and Nevada. Thank you. Chris Foran [REDACTED]
752	Chris Kantner	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Air Permit TEXT/COMMENTS: I am an archaeologist and museum specialist living in Cortez, Colorado. I am very much AGAINST the building of this plant. There is so much destruction happening to our environment already and I don't want to see anymore. We can see the haze from the plants already existing. We all know that the plants burn at night so no one can visually see the horrible impacts. We live in an area of incredibly valuable cultural and environmental resources. We all chose to live here because we love our landscape and our clean air and we will do what we can to protect it. Not only will this plant contribute to a decline in people's quality of life through the water they drink and the air they breath, it will have the same impacts on our plant and animal population. I am concerned about the dispersion modeling and how those impacts are justified. I see room for much error in this and the people who are doing those models are not ground-truthing. We see the haze every day and know there is a problem. If you are touting a clean-burning, most-technologically advanced power plant, why will you trade pollution credits to the other facilities in the area with no net reduction in air pollutants? Thank you for allowing us to comment.
753	Chuck McAfee	SUBJECT: comments TEXT/COMMENTS: I wish to register my opposition to the plan, as I currently understand it, for the Desert Rock Power Plant. I am totally opposed to doing anything that causes any more air pollution in our region. I was born in Cortez 65 years ago and have watched the skyline disappear to the south and southwest. It is happening because of power plants, and to let it continue, let alone cause it to get worse, is simply unacceptable to me. The track record of entities who claim that the emissions will be clean is abysmal. It appears that politics and money trump health and environmental concerns every time. For once, let's make a decision that benefits the health and well-being of the people who live here, in contrast to benefiting the wealth and political position of people who have not shown evidence of giving a damn about the region nor the people who inhabit the region. Do not allow this power plant to be built. Sincerely, Chuck McAfee [REDACTED] Lewis CO 81327 [REDACTED]
754	Claire May	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Clean Air Act TEXT/COMMENTS: Another power plant? That magnificent rock in Shiprock must righteously shiver on its foundation! More pollution in the air or in the waters is not what we need in this area. Money should not be speaking when it comes to the lives of humans and animals. Please do not permit this project. Claire May, Ignacio, Colorado.
755	Ric Plese	SUBJECT: Greed: TEXT/COMMENTS: Please do not shove this power plant in our area of the country because we are rural and our health and complaints are dismiss able. To bribe a few native americans with grandiose ideas of richness at the expense of their environment and health and the air quality of all of us in the Four Corners is despicable. Do the right thing and use wind and solar power to make the energy . Greed will catch up with all of you guilty parties soon. Short term gains are worth it if our world is less healthy to live in. Do not write off the power of a bunch of rural four corner people and the native

Num ber		Notes
		american population in this country to protest and block this dinosaur technology from going through. The mass media will be in our favor. Sincerely yours , Ric Plese
756	Connie Gordon	SUBJECT: Proposed Power Plant - Desert Rock TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Sir: I am writing with my concern for permitting the construction of the proposed coal-burning Desert Rock Power Plant in northern New Mexico. I realize the need for generating additional power, but I disagree with the methods for producing this power. Air pollution in this part of the country is a great concern, and although this plant will be cleaner than older plants in the vicinity (they historically are some of the dirtiest plants in the country) I believe it needs to be constructed to even stricter standards than proposed. Integrated gasification combined cycle design should be mandatory for all new plants, and a state of the art facility should be constructed here, not the pulverized coal-fired boiler system proposed. The proposed plant will only contribute to the already tainted air quality in the region. We need to start making this world a better place, not contributing to existing environmental problems. A zero-emission power plant should be the ultimate goal. Is this government and the EPA up to challenging manufacturers to fulfill this goal? Connie I. Gordon Responsive Designs, Architects [REDACTED] Durango, CO 81301 [REDACTED]
757	DahlquistRichey	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear EPA Officials, Do the right thing. Get a full environmental impact statement for Desert Rock, taking into account all the other power plants, oil field generators/engines/vehicle traffic, and existing air pollution, when you do this assessment. Air pollution affects all of us, rich and poor, and has what may be to you the hidden costs of health degradation for all area residents. Why is the Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association build a coal-fired plant using gasification technology, which is the best current technology for reducing pollution, and Desert Rock isn't? And not looking at mercury pollution because you don't have to until later in the process is somewhat like burying your head in the sand, since area lakes, such as Vallecito, already have mercury problems. When I was growing up EPA stood against polluters and for the people. I would like to believe that government is still for the people, and that you will protect our air and water. Sincerely, Janet Dahlquist [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Durango CO 81303
758	Dan Barnes	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Permit TEXT/COMMENTS: EPA Administrator: We only have ten to fifteen years to prevent tipping the balance toward inevitable climate change due to global warming. The Four Corners Area of the Southwest already has air pollution equal to that of a large city. We are producing enough power to satisfy our needs now. If California needs more electricity, let them build their own power plants. How do we clean the air, once it gets "dirty"? Do not allow the Desert Rock Power Plant to go on the Navajo Reservation. Please encourage these power companies to pursue renewable and clean sources of electric power. Help us give a non-polluted planet to our children. Dan Barnes
759	Dana Day	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Proposal TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Robert, It is with much doubt and disheartenment that I write to you in hopes that another power plant will not be "planted" in our midst. The truth is, according to those in power, our health is for sale, and undoubtedly it will likely be sold - yet again. Our homeland residents are currently stricken with breathing disorders and neurological impairments from the high levels of power plant pollutants that enter our bodies daily through the air and water around us. I'm sure you've surveyed the data - our homeland of the Four Corners already hosts two of the

Num ber		Notes
		most caustic power plants of our Northern Hemisphere and yet the quest for monetary profit by placing another power plant in our region continues to be ensued. Do those in your position and with whom you work not want to do something to better the environment and quality of human life? Why not set up the world's largest photovoltaic sun harvesting or wind turbine system and let the health of our planet, it's inhabitants and profit yields synergize for the highest good. The time to care about the effects of our actions is now, the time to act on behalf of tomorrow is today, the time to change our course of action is in this moment of consciousness. Peace to you as you choose carefully how and where you will align your power, Dana Day Farmington, New Mexico
760	Dave Kinsey	SUBJECT: TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear EPA, Please use this e-mail to formally register my disapproval of the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant. The residents of the four corners area are already being adversely effected by extremely poor air quality created by the existing two (supposedly EPA controlled) power plants. A person doesn't need to be too smart to see that we are polluting this planet (our home) possibly to its death. Please deny this permit and help show the people of the planet that you (and we) are truly interested in creating alternative energy sources as apposed to the current ones that create more of the same filthy air. Thank you, Dave Kinsey
761	Dave Kinsey	SUBJECT: TEXT/COMMENTS: I am opposed to another coal fired power plant in our area because the air here is already polluted. Also, please address the CO2 emissions not only for this plant but all power plants. Thanks for your consideration. Dave Kinsey
762	Dave Rich	SUBJECT: Desert Rock TEXT/COMMENTS: I am opposed to building the proposed plant because I think it will cause more air pollution in the Four Corners area and lessen visibility in Mesa Verde National Park and the Weiminuche Wilderness Area. Thank you for considering my input. Dave Rich
763	David and Nancy Shippis	SUBJECT: power plant proposal TEXT/COMMENTS: We strongly oppose the building of another coal-fired power plant in northwest New Mexico. The "benefit" of additional power is cancelled out by the negative effects of a coal-fired plant: -the dangerous impact of mercury on the entire biotic community, which includes humans, especially children -the spread of pollutants over the entire four corners region, especially the impoverished Navajo Nation -the increase of pollutants that cause global warming In 1997 the EPA considered mercury to have the greatest potential to impact humans health of all pollutants mentioned in the Clean Air Act. The current administration has now removed mercury from the "Hazardous Criteria Pollutants" for which a company, such as Sithe, must meet standards when applying for a design permit to build a new coal-fired power plant. Mercury is no less dangerous, it is just no longer being regulated in favor of big business. "We abuse land because we regard it as a commodity belonging to us. When we see land as a community to which we belong, we may begin to use it with love and respect." Aldo Leopold Please reconsider allowing this permit to be approved. Our health is at stake. thank you, Nancy and David Shippis Durango, CO
764	David and Nzali Campbell	SUBJECT: re permit, please don't do this TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Sirs, I live between Cortez and Dolores in Colorado. My children, my self, and my spouse now suffer from far more asthma, allergies, and respiratory illness then we ever have before, and it seems to get worse every year. We do appreciate that you have forced the filthy existing two plants to clean up their emissions, but they still continue to make a real mess of our lives, and a new plant would just make things worse. Get the other plants cleaned up to State of The Art Technology. Then make this one a clean coal gasification plant, and we will support this.

Num ber		Notes
		Sincerely, David Campbell [REDACTED], CO 81323
765	Kenneth Alan Collins	<p>SUBJECT: Comment on Desert Rock Power Plant Project TEXT/COMMENTS: To Whom It May Concern: As a resident of northern New Mexico and a citizen who cares tremendously about air quality in the desert southwest, and who spends much time outdoors, the major thrust of my comment is that as a result of existing power plants in the four corners area and in Nevada, the once pristine air of this part of the country has been seriously degraded, affecting health, remedial costs, and the quality of life. Despite assurances that the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant will use the latest technologies to keep air pollution to an absolute minimum, I am afraid such assurances are easy to make and much more difficult to fulfill. I am greatly concerned that in fact, moving ahead on building this plant on top of the existing ones which have caused such terrible damage to our region will make the situation worse. This is one citizen of New Mexico who would like to register my opposition to building yet another plant in the Four Corners area. Kenneth Alan Collins [REDACTED] Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501</p>
766	David Lien	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: David A. Lien [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Colorado Springs, CO 80906 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] October 7, 2006 Robert Baker, Air-3 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 75 Hawthorne St., San Francisco, CA 94105 desertrockairpermit@epa.gov Dear Sir: I am writing to oppose the Sithe Global Energy Desert Rock coal-fired power plant. This plant will contribute to global warming and pollute the already negatively impacted Four Corners air quality with additional mercury, sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen oxides. As an avid hunter, camper, hiker and climber, and a member of the Colorado Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, I spend many weekends exploring and experiencing our public lands in Colorado and the Four Corners region feel that we need more of a balance between preservation and development. In a nutshell, we need more designated outstanding waters, Wilderness Areas, Roadless Areas, National Parks, Monuments, Conservation Areas, and Wildlife Refuges to let us escape from the noise, pollution, traffic and trappings of civilization that are slowly but surely degrading our way of life. With plans for 150 new coal-fired power plants in the works, America has the potential to move backwards in the fight against global warming. A recent study by the New Jersey Public Interest Research Group concludes that building these proposed plants will increase health-threatening air pollution, threaten the health of our streams and rivers and will increase total U.S. global warming pollution, by 10 percent.[1] Approximately 40 percent of carbon dioxide and 25 percent of nitrogen oxide emissions in the country come from electric power plants.[2] If instead of investing the \$137 billion in new coal plants as currently proposed, if the energy companies invested that same amount in energy efficiency, we could see a 19 percent reduction in electricity demand, completely alleviating the need to build any new power plants.[3] The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) released a report during 2004 concluding that clean air regulations alone bring Americans between \$101 billion and \$119 billion in benefits each year, including fewer hospitalizations and lost workdays from illness caused by pollution. The cost to companies, meanwhile, is between \$8 billion and \$8.8 billion. Put plainly, the benefits of these regulations outweigh the cost by 10 to 15 times.[4] Pollution also takes a heavy toll on the economy. For example, an estimated 300,000 babies are born each year with dangerous levels of the toxic metal mercury, which is linked to learning disabilities and lowered IQs. The resulting loss of adult productivity, according to a recent study by researchers from the Mt. Sinai School of Medicine and Harvard Medical School, costs the nation \$8.7 billion</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>annually. Another study by some of the same researchers calculated the total healthcare cost of pollution's effects on children at \$55 billion per year, more than one of the Bush administration's recent budget request for the Iraq war.[5] In particular, regarding the proposed Desert Rock power plant: Given that the San Juan Generating Station and Four Corners Power Plant are well documented as two of the major polluting power plants in the U.S., why does the EPA consider the adjacent siting of Desert Rock appropriate? What about SOx, CO and NOx emissions? The EPA should recite, specifically, the methodology used for the air quality modeling. Why were monitors in Farmington, New Mexico and Rio Rancho, New Mexico used for background concentrations of pollutants in the modeling for Desert Rock, rather than local monitors near the project site south of Shiprock? What was done in the modeling to analyze cumulative air quality impacts? Given the documented health advisories in the region for Mercury, how does the EPA plan on complying with the Clean Air Mercury Rule (2005) to permanently limit and reduce mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants? Ask the EPA how mercury advisories are affecting Navajo Lake, McPhee Reservoir, the San Juan River, and Vallecito Lake. Given that ozone levels in the Farmington, New Mexico area may soon exceed ozone limits and that nitrogen oxides are a necessary component in the formation of ozone, how will Desert Rock affect ozone levels in the Four Corners region? Given the growing consensus about global warming caused by carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions, and the likelihood that CO2 will be regulated in the near future, how can EPA ignore the vast contribution to global warming caused by Desert Rock? Why is the EPA allowing the high concentration of power plants in the Four Corners region degrading public health and quality of life? What will occur to visibility in Class I areas like Mesa Verde National Park and Weminuche Wilderness? Does the Draft Air Permit take into account non-stationary air quality effects (including projected fugitive dust) associated with the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant? How are the non-stationary and stationary air quality impacts of the Desert Rock Power Plant evaluated cumulatively? How does Desert Rock comply with Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations." Compliance with Environmental Justice is required for the Air Quality permit, where issues of concern include, "Disproportionate exposure to pollutants, potential health problems (respiratory, heavy metals in fish)." How can the Draft Air Quality Permit be evaluated when the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the entire project has yet to be released? Why does the comment period for the air quality permit close (October 27, 2006) before the Draft EIS is released to the public later this year? How does the public know that the entire proposed Desert Rock project and associated infrastructure is incorporated and evaluated in the proposed Air Quality Permit? Where will the power generated by Desert Rock be transmitted to and what will be the associated air quality impacts? Has the proper modeling been applied to the analysis of Desert Rock? What is the background monitoring data for the Desert Rock project, such as for ammonia, and how is it applied to the PSD permit in the analysis of Best Available Control Technology? The U.S. is a nation of vast resources and spectacular beauty, but much of it has been or is being developed, logged, mined, and crisscrossed with roads and snowmobile and OHV trails. Consequently, today wildlands and wildlife are disappearing faster than ever. Wise leaders like the great conservationist Teddy Roosevelt recognized the need to set aside parts of the land to be unspoiled for future generations. It's time we started following in his footsteps. For too long our</p>

Num ber		Notes
		public lands have been managed for the betterment of the corporate balance sheet and not for the betterment of the American public. Today Americans are demanding that these lands be preserved in their natural state, for the betterment of wilderness, wildlife, and future generations. Please do all that you can to ensure that this happens, and include me on your mailing list for any future public involvement in this process. Thank you. Sincerely, David A. Lien Member, Backcountry Hunters and Anglers; Member, Republicans for Environmental Protection; Member, Colorado Mountain Club [1] Sierra Club. "Coal Rush: Stepping Back." Currents: 7/25/06 [2] Frances Cerra Whittelsey. "Scum of the Air." Sierra: May/June 2006, p.13 [3] Sierra Club. "Coal Rush: Stepping Back." Currents: 7/25/06 [4] John H. Adams. "Illogical Extremes." Onearth: Winter 2004, p.4 [5] Monika Bauerlein. "Every Breath You Take." Sierra: July/August 2006
767	Deb Nielsen	SUBJECT: comment TEXT/COMMENTS: I want to comment on the air permit for the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant. In recent public hearings it was revealed that you have not agreed to measure carbon dioxide, mercury or ozone levels in the air surrounding this plant if it is built. What kind of environmental protection is that? San Juan Generating Station generates 13.1 million tons of carbon dioxide into our air each year. This plant is one of the dirtiest polluters in the nation. And Desert Rock will spew 13.7 tons each year. How can you call that CLEAN? Farmington air quality is already at risk for ozone level, according to the EPA, and our local national parks have a high level of air pollution including mercury... I don't think you have done enough to look at these issues and Desert Rock does NOT deserve a permit! Deb Nielsen [REDACTED] Bayfield, CO 81122
768	Dianna May	SUBJECT: TEXT/COMMENTS: I am opposed to the Desert Rock power plant. We do not need another pollution-spewing plant in this part of the country. Please don't be shortsighted. Plan now for clean air for future generations.
769	James Porter	SUBJECT: Energy!!!! TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear EPA: We are seeing our cost of electricity increasing dramatically. I urge you to support The Desert Rock Power Plant in our area. Don't let our electricity have the shortage like the petroleum has went. PLEASE FOR OUR Future, James Porter [REDACTED] Cortez, CO 81321 [REDACTED]
770	Doug & Linda SMITH	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Official, I am a resident of the Four Corners area and live in San Juan County New Mexico off of the Navajo Indian Reservation. I am very concerned about the construction of the power plant and its effect on the area. First, you did not properly scope the impacts and hold sufficient meetings to include Farmington, NM with is the largest city in the four corners area. Currently the sky is affected by existing power plant pollutants and adding additional matter to the air has to affect the air quality. Ozone and mercury are some by products that are of grave concern. Several Class I areas exist that require protection yet degradation is planned and allowed to continue. There are health issues in the area related to air quality (one example is the concentration asthmatic people). I am no expert in air quality but I know when I walk out in the mornings a see a haze extend up and down the San Juan River that something is not working right and needs corrected without adding to the problem. Warnings at local lakes for pregnant women to not eat the fish due to mercury concentrations says something about what past actions are doing to the environment. Thank you for your time. Douglas G Smith [REDACTED] Farmington, NM 87401
771	EARL JAMES	SUBJECT: TEXT/COMMENTS: I am writing to urge you to oppose the building of the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant in the Farmington area. As you

Number		Notes
		<p>know, Desert Rock Power Plant is a 1,500 megawatt coal-fired power plant proposed by Sithe Global Power, LLC on a 580-acre site approximately 25 miles southwest of Farmington, New Mexico on the Navajo Nation. Though touted as an economic development opportunity, this plant will in fact have very seriously detrimental environmental and economic consequences for the Four Corners region. Desert Rock will contaminate the air and water of the area; two existing plants in the vicinity have been called two of the worst point-sources of pollution in the U.S. by the Environmental Protection Agency, spewing concentrations of a number of pollutants proven to be damaging to human health and the environment. The plant will irresponsibly use copious amount of New Mexico's precious water; Desert Rock Power Plant would use 4,500-acre-feet of water while local residents are unequipped with modern conveniences such as sinks, toilets, and bathtubs. Threats to human health posed by the contamination of the plant abound; a study needs to be conducted to address current health problems from the existing plants and lack of access to healthcare for local residents. The plant is a racist exploitation of the sacred Navajo land; local residents object to the desecration of burials sites and the destruction of homes which have remained in their community since time immemorial. In addition, Sithe Global Power is receiving tax breaks that seem almost criminal. While the plant is being touted as an economic development opportunity for the Navajo Nation, testimony before the state legislators revealed details of tax breaks approved by the Navajo Tax Commission giving Sithe Global dramatic tax cuts. The company would see an 85% savings on their tax bill during construction. The deals would save them 75% during the first 10 years of operation and 61% over the following 15 years. In sum, the Navajo Nation would receive less than one third - 32 percent - of the tax revenues it would normally receive under tribal statutes. But Sithe wants more. Under SB 464, the company gets 3 different options for calculating its tax burden - and Sithe Global gets to choose which formula to use to minimize its tax burden! One of the 3 formulas requires them to pay only whatever annual fee they can negotiate with the Navajo Nation (as noted in the previous section). Another provision in the bill severely limits the maximum tax the company could pay to 60 million. Do the right thing and oppose SB 464! New Mexicans do not need or want another coal-fired power plant in our state. Safer and cleaner energy options are available. Rather than depleting our natural resources, our cultural heritage, and the inheritance of our future generations by continuing to build coal-fired fire plants, we as a state must invest in alternatives. For all these reasons, I implore you to fight the irreversible contamination of the northwest corner of our state. Earl James [REDACTED] Santa Fe, NM 87504-1554 [REDACTED]</p>
772	W Warman	<p>Info R9@EPA cc: Subject: (299164654) Region 9 Information Request email [REDACTED] name w. warman org citizen phone 9702595177 request RE: Proposed power plant in the four corners area. Please understand the need to have the scientific study of this proposal examined in detail. The stakes are high for the health of the people living in the area. The environment in the four corners area is under siege from the current barrage of chemicals spewed into the air. Please demand that the beneficiaries of the project be responsible citizens and act as stewards of the land. Thank-you W Warman</p>
773	Anna M. Frazier	<p>SUBJECT: Fw: Regarding Civil Rights Complaint TEXT/COMMENTS: Ed Pike US Environmental Protection Agency phone: (415) 972-3970 www.epa.gov/region09 ----- Forwarded by Ed Pike/R9/USEPA/US on 11/09/2006 09:18 AM ----- "Anna M. Frazier" 11/09/2006 08:51 AM To Ed Pike/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Regarding Civil Rights Complaint Dear</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>Mr. Pike and the US EPA: The US EPA's response to my complaint about the microphone being taken from me at the US EPA meeting about the proposed Desert Rock power plant is inadequate. The email you sent only gave us a few additional days to provide extra comments, but that is inadequate and does not address our concerns about EPA's outrageous actions that violated my civil rights as a tribal member attempting to participate in a US EPA public process. Once again we in Dine' CARE demand an extension of the public comment period and new public hearings on US EPA's draft permit. I look forward to your prompt response. Sincerely, Anna M. Frazier, Dine' CARE</p>
774	El Brown	<p>SUBJECT: Have you received any Desert Rock Air Permit Comments! TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Mr. Baker, I am a very concerned citizen and a resident of San Juan County. To be more specific, I live very close to the proposed desert rock power plant. My question is, have you received very many comments regarding the Air Permit? Thank you, El Brown, El Brown Pre-Paid Legal Services, Inc. Independent Associate (505) 326-7279 Toll Free: 1-877-624-0505 E:Mail: el_brown@pre-paidlegal.com www.prepaidlegal.com/hub/el_brown www.prepaidlegal.com Get today's hot entertainment gossip</p>
775	Ed and Julie Ward-Lehner	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: To Whom it May Concern; Please add us to those who are adamantly opposed to the Desert Rock Power Plant. This plant will do nothing but to the already heavy pollution in the Four Corners area. The City of Farmington is already at allowable maximum for ozone pollution. (We suggest that you contact the Dallas EPA Office as they have been working with Farmington for some years to work out a solution.) We are not supposed to eat fish from our lakes due to high mercury levels. Mesa Verde archeological areas are being threatened by heavy air pollution. One needs to only go to Mesa Verde Far View area and see for themselves the yellow haze hanging over the area. The existing San Juan Generating Station outside of Farmington has been given the proper designation as one of America's filthiest power plants, emitting 13.1 million tons of carbon dioxide into our air every year. Sithe's proposed "state of the art" Desert Rock power plant will emit in the neighborhood of 13.7 million tons of carbon dioxide per year. This is supposed to be one of the cleanest power plants in the country and it exceeds one of the dirtiest in carbon dioxide output. How does that figure? Desert Rock should not be granted a permit to build. It is a bad idea at a bad time. Our air is already polluted. Our area cannot and should not have to handle more pollution. Our air is already a health risk. And what about global warming? These are realities that will not go away. Ed and Julie Ward-Lehner [REDACTED] Durango, CO 81303 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p>
776	emily wegener	<p>SUBJECT: desert rock permit TEXT/COMMENTS: To the EPA San Francisco, CA As a resident of San Juan County, New Mexico I urge you to deny a "Prevention of Significant Deterioration" permit for the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant. Our air quality has already been compromised by two coal-fired power plants in the county. Most mornings there is an ugly haze hanging over the San Juan River valley downwind from the power plants. I believe the pollution from existing power plant emissions is responsible for the high incidence of upper respiratory disease and allergies in San Juan County. Desert Rock Power Plant would have a negative affect on the health of thousands of citizens in the Four Corners area. Emily Wegener Get your email and see which of your friends are online - Right on the New Yahoo.com (http://www.yahoo.com/preview)</p>

Num ber		Notes
777	Eric Miller	SUBJECT: proposed desert rock power plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Since there is already an air quality problem in the four corners area, my coment on the new permit proposed for the Desert Rock Power Plant is as follows: If the new power plant is allowed to operate, emissions from the other two power plants already in the area will need to be reduced by at least the amount that the new power plant will contribute. Dr. Eric Miller, Professor Department of Chemistry San Juan College Farmington, NM 87402 505-566-3229 millere@sanjuancollege.edu
778	Laurie Fredette	SUBJECT: Do Not Approve TEXT/COMMENTS: As a Durango resident I do NOT want this power plant or any like it. This area is one of the few places left in the country that is beautiful and clean. We are already being bombarded by well development. I do not want the additional air pollution and ANY mercury in our lakes is unacceptable. It is past time for our country to move away from fossil fuels. This is the best area in the country for solar and we need to move forward with developing our future ALTERNATIVE energy needs. It would be a boost to this lagging administration to start now. My vote is a loud NO! Laurie Fredette Durango, Colorado
779	Laurie Fredette	SUBJECT: NO to Desert Rock!! TEXT/COMMENTS: Hello, I live up wind in Colorado of the 2 Coal Fired Power Plants near Farmington, NM and there is NO WAY that a 3rd Power Plant, however "supposedly" clean it is going to be, should be located here! I have lived here for 10 years and the pollution has been getting steadily worse and this new power plant will only serve to make things worse than ever! Please dont allow Big Dollars to ruin another Beautiful Area of America and its Blue Skies!! Thank you! The Freitag Family Durango, Colorado
780	Michael A. Vigil	SUBJECT: Granting Permit TEXT/COMMENTS: To Whom It May Concern: The granting of a permit by the EPA for the construction of the Desert Rock Power Plant will help the economy of San Juan County to grow and provide jobs for the Navajo People. The impact upon air and water quality will be minimum. The technology exists today to add scrubbers and other devices to reduce toxic emissions into the air. By the EPA granting a permit for this power plant, we will be assured of cost effective electricity in this area as well as providing jobs for the local community. This power plant, and others are needed to help the US maintain its present standard of living and to avert power shortages as demand increases in the future. The Red Rock Power Plant is a win win proposal. Michael A. Vigil Check out the new AOL. Most comprehensive set of free safety and security tools, free access to millions of high-quality videos from across the web, free AOL Mail and more.
781	Geoff Craig	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Coal Fired Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear EPA: I have lived in Durango, Colorado for over 30 years, and have watched our precious air in the Four Corners become dirtier and dirtier as the two existing coal plants in the area spew pollutants into the air year after year after year. Our once pristine blue vistas are now hazy. Officials tell us to be careful about eating the fish because of mercury. Our carbon dioxide emissions are warming the earth at an alarming rate, causing oceans to rise, climates to change, habitat loss for polar bears and other species, and many other negative impacts. It is short-sighted and irresponsible for the EPA to even consider granting a permit to Desert Rock. I have read that Desert Rock will spew an additional 13.7 million tons of CO2 into the air annually. That is more than the San Juan Generating Station, which is one of America's filthiest power plants. Instead of considering new coal fired power plants, we should be requiring the existing ones to clean up their act. Additionally, help us fill new

Number		Notes
		<p>and existing power needs from clean technologies, like solar, wind, and hydrogen fuel cells, through incentives, research and development, and if necessary, mandates. We must cut back our pollution emissions now, not increase them. The public hearings on this project demonstrated that For the sake our health, the planet's health, the animals, and our children and grandchildren, please deny a permit for Desert Rock, and turn your attention to pursuing clean energy technologies. The public hearings on Desert Rock demonstrated that Four Corners residents are very much against this project. Please, listen to the people, do what is right, and deny this project. Thank you for your attention to this very important matter. Geoff Craig Try Search Survival Kits: Fix up your home and better handle your cash with Live Search! http://imagine-windowslive.com/search/kits/default.aspx?kit=improve&locale=en-US&source=hmtagline</p>
782	George Hays	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock - Request to extend comment period TEXT/COMMENTS: This is a message from George Hays, an attorney representing Environmental Defense ("ED"). ED is coordinating with a number of other groups, including NRDC, Clean Air Task Force, and Sierra Club, in preparing comments on the Desert Rock PSD Permit. Pursuant to 40 CFR Part 124, we respectfully request an extension of the comment period on the Desert Rock PSD permit until November 17. We request this limited extension in part because we received today some copies of documents that are part of the docket in this matter, and we would like to have a meaningful opportunity to review them. Also, we (through Vicki Stamper), recently requested certain modeling files (request made 10/12), and received them on October 20. Again, we need a little more time to process that information. Thank you in advance for your consideration of this request. Sincerely, George E. Hays</p>
783	Glenn Landers	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock comments TEXT/COMMENTS: Robert Baker, Air-3 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 75 Hawthorne St., San Francisco, CA 94105 Nov. 13, 2006 Dear Mr. Baker, I would like to submit the following comments regarding the proposed PSD permit for the Desert Rock facility, to be located on the Navajo Nation near Shiprock, NM. I am a resident of New Mexico who has visited and recreated in the area that would be impacted by this facility, should it be constructed. Mercury emissions From emission factors found in AP-42, it seems to me that uncontrolled mercury emissions from a facility this size would be at a level that requires best available control technology. The Ambient Air Quality Impact Report (AAQIR) for Desert Rock, however, puts potential mercury emissions at a level of 0.057 tons per year for the entire project, which is below the PSD significance level. My guess is that this is because control devices required by the permit for other pollutants also remove mercury to the point that the facility is eligible to be a synthetic minor for mercury. My understanding is, however, that for the facility to be a synthetic minor for mercury, restrictions on emissions must be practically enforceable and federally enforceable, and I question whether this is the case with this proposed facility. The draft permit does not mention mercury as far as I can find, so even though there may be a control or controls that remove mercury, and those may be practically and federally enforceable with regard to the pollutants that are associated with the control(s) in the permit, I don't think they can establish the facility as a synthetic minor for mercury without specifically saying so in the permit. The permit should, assuming EPA has the regulatory authority, specify that mercury is limited below PSD thresholds and it should tell what devices do that, what control efficiency they are intended to have for mercury, and give testing and reporting requirements to ensure the emissions</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>stay below the threshold. Failing that, the facility should have a synthetic minor permit from a federally approved minor source permitting program, so that the provisions are federally enforceable. This permit should be either already approved, or the PSD permit should be contingent on the issuance of such a permit. Should EPA lack the authority to add federally enforceable limitations to the PSD permit, and if there is no other way to ensure federally enforceable restrictions on mercury emission, then it is my belief that mercury needs to be treated as subject to PSD and a BACT analysis needs to be done. Sulfur dioxide emissions I have not been able to find it the permit any requirement for testing sulfur levels in the coal. My understanding is that the associated mine will perform some mixing of the coal prior to shipping it to the facility. If this is to control sulfur levels, then it seems possible that coal could be received by the facility that has too high a sulfur content. It seems to me that keeping sulfur levels in the coal below a certain level is as much a part of BACT as the use of control devices, since emission levels depend on both. Sulfur levels, then, should be below the amount used to determine BACT, even if the use of higher sulfur coal somehow does not cause the facility to violate an emission limit. The permit should require either the mine to document that the coal delivered is below the necessary sulfur content, or require the permittee to test the sulfur content in the coal. There should also be appropriate reporting requirements. Efficiency of control devices I have not found any mention in the permit of required efficiencies of control devices. Since the determination of BACT is based on these control efficiencies, they need to be specified in the permit, along with testing, monitoring, and reporting requirements to ensure the devices remain within the performance range required. For example, the permit has a requirement for fabric filters. I believe the permit should specify some efficiency level for the filters. The permit should require that the efficiency should be monitored either directly, by having continuous emission monitors before and after the filter, or parametrically by monitoring continuously some variable that works as a reliable indicator of efficiency, like the pressure drop. If an appropriate pressure drop can not be determined now, than the permit should require that the filters operate at or above the pressure drop that occurs at the time the facility establishes compliance with emission limits. Something like this should be done for every control device. There should also be a reporting requirement any time a control device's efficiency, or its measured parameter, is outside the required range. Environmental justice issues My understanding is that the EPA recognizes there are environmental justice issues involved in this permitting action, but is unwilling to deal with them in the context of this permit. Instead, I understand that EPA promises to do something about environmental justice at some later date, is some different process. I am concerned about this for a couple reasons. First, it seems to me that the EPA is required to take environmental justice into consideration in all of its actions that involve an environmental justice concern. Unless EPA has plan to do something soon that will remove all disparate impacts, how can the agency refuse to use a valuable tool like the PSD permit? Second, the public can not respond adequately to the environmental justice aspects of the permitting action if they are told that that issue will be dealt with later in some different action. This asks the public to weigh the known against the unknown and form a judgment that no one can make. And, should they adopt the wait and see approach and it turns out the EPA action is not adequate, the public will have missed an important opportunity in this permitting process to deal with disparate impacts. Sincerely, Glenn Landers [REDACTED]. Las Cruces, NM 88005 [REDACTED]</p>

Number		Notes
784	Greg Munro	SUBJECT: desert rock power plant TEXT/COMMENTS: I support the desert rock power plant being built for the following reasons; The South West is already in short supply of power generation and more is drastically needed soon The Navajo Nation will be helped The new coal fired generation technology is advancing every day - thus once desert rock in constructed, the most advanced technology will be is use which will reduce pollutants more than any other industry. I support EPA's already procedures and permit requirements that are in place. Thank You Greg Munro
785	Guadalupe Branch	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: I am a concerned citizen of the Navajo Nation that opposes the Desert Rock Power Plant. First of all, the pollution located around Farmington, NM, is atrocious. On a recent visit I obtained a sickness that is almost indescribable because the closest relative this bug had was the flu and allergies. However, it could not necessarily be classified. To tell people that this Power Plant is beneficial is fraud. Sure it may possible create jobs for the next 11 years, but what is community to do when all these resources are depleted and the locals receive nothing. Too many times has a large corportation bulldozed their way into a quiet community and suck the life out of it, along with their resources. The EPA needs to realize their true mission: Protect the Environment. So far, you are doing a shabby job and letting money interfere with your former objectives. Pollution is all together a bad situation. Our ozone layer is already depleting and Global Warming is increasing. Does this company really want to be responsible for the results that will undoubtably happen. Please consider this and reevaluate what you are going to allow to happen. Want to start your own business? Learn how on Yahoo! Small Business.
786	Hal Shepherd	SUBJECT: City of Cortez, CO objection to this perimit TEXT/COMMENTS: Mr Robert Baker Air Division (AIR-3) EPA Region 9 75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, CA 94105-3901 Dear Sir; On behalf of the City of Cortez, Colorado I am writing our objection to the issuance ot the Desert Rock air permit since the public has not seen the environmental impact statement yet. We already suffer from the operations of the Four Corners Power Plant which should be shut down due to their air pollution from this old and outdated power plant that is allowed to operate. The Four Corners area already suffers from very high levels of pollution from the existing power plants in our area. The pollution from these power plants are destroying Mesa Verde National Park; Natural Bridges National Monument; Canyons of the Ancients National Monument as well creating health problems for our populations in the four states. Please investigate the Four Corners Power Plant and make them improve it or shut it down before building another power plant here. Hal Shepherd City Manager City of Cortez, CO On behalf of the Cortez City Council cc Cortez City Council Representative John Salazar Senator Ken Salazar I've stopped 12,003 spam messages. You can too! One month FREE spam protection at www.cloudmark.com
787	Hal Shoemaker	SUBJECT: Proposed Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Open letter to the Environmental Protection Agency % Robert Baker We have grave concerns regarding the proposed Desert Rock Coal-Fired Power Plant as reflected in the following questions: 1. How much mercury would Desert Rock emit into the atmosphere? 2. When combined with the Four Corners, San Juan and Navajo coal-fired power plants, what would the total amount of mercury emissions be? 3. How much of these total mercury emissions would fall on the Southwest Colorado water shed area? 4. At what level are mercury emissions falling on the Southwest Colorado watershed area considered hazardous

Number		Notes
		health and life (aquatic, animal, human)? 5. When will equipment that can accurately measure and control mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants be available? 6. When and at what levels will mercury emissions from the above mentioned coal-fired power plants be controlled by law? 7. Our Lake Vallecito, once considered among the most pristine lakes in the west, has been polluted with mercury to the extent that a fish consumption advisory has been posted. What can we tell our community members and visitors about the future of our lake? The Vallecito Water Test Volunteers, Pine River Watershed Group Hamilton Wright - Volunteer Coordinator (970) 884-9372 cc. Representative John T. Salazar Dale Rodebaugh, Durango Herald
788	Hal Shoemaker	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: I am adamantly opposed to the proposed coal-fired, pollution spewing, global warming, mercury poisoning Desert Rock power plant. Hal Shoemaker All-in-one security and maintenance for your PC. Get a free 90-day trial! http://clk.atdmt.com/MSN/go/msnnkwlo0050000002msn/direct/01/?href=http://www.windowsoncare.com/?sc_cid=msn_hotmail
789	Holly Rankin	SUBJECT: comments on desert rock TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Robert Baker, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Clean Air Act Prevention of Significant Deterioration permit. Wow, that is a whopper of a permit name. As the permit implies it is about prevention. I was incredulous when a staff member of the EPA came to Durango and pronounced that our air is clean "enough" to absorb more pollutants! How arrogant, insensitive and malicious that statement was. About a month ago the public relations officer for Sithe Global wrote a letter in the Durango Herald, our local paper, asserting that we were all naive to think that a letter writing campaign would stop the construction of this plant, alluding to the fact that it is all but a done deal. How insulting to the people of this region who live with the incessant deterioration of the quality of air that we have to breathe. And make no mistake, we have to breathe this air. When I drive back to Durango from the west, as I descend into the valley that holds the town, I look out on an incredible vista. I am reminded what it is like to descend the Cajon Pass into San Bernidino, west of Los Angeles, CA. The view that I see here is smog, a brown yellow haze hanging low over the land, the blanket of air that we breathe. Our air is already laden with a heavy concentration of pollutants and we cannot afford anymore, contrary to what you people at the EPA believe. How disingenuous of the EPA to not consider mercury levels as part of the PSD program. Mercury is insidious in our environment today. The EPA should be doing everything possible to lower the levels of mercury, not encouraging the assault on our environment by circumventing the Clean Air Act. The EPA is charged by the public, not a political organization, not a private corporation, but the people of the United States, with upholding the federal law. By excising mercury levels out of the equation the EPA is violating the public trust and federal law. I encourage you to deny this permit for the Desrt Rock Power Plant. Respectfully submitted, Holly Rankin [REDACTED] Hesperus, CO 81326 [REDACTED]
790	Randy Waslien Kristen Nielsen	SUBJECT: Clean Air TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Robert, I live in Durango, CO and am concerned about the quality of our air and water. I believe that any new power plants built should only be constructed with the best technology available. Fifty years from now we cannot go back and undo what damage has been done to our environment and health of our citizens. The EPA is mandated with the responsibility of upholding the values that were put forth upon establishment of this agency. You are the watchdog of our environmental health. Do not take this responsibility lightly. The EIS process must be

Number		Notes
		completed before any permits are issued. We live here. This is our home. Randy Waslien Kristen Nielsen
791	John H. and Judith A. Schuenemeyer	<p>SUBJECT: Comments on proposed Desert Rock Clean Air Act permit</p> <p>TEXT/COMMENTS: COMMENTS ON U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (REGION IX) PROPOSED PREVENTION OF SIGNIFICANT DETERIORATION PERMIT-DESERT ROCK ENERGY FACILITY 1. It is unusual for EPA to issue a proposed PSD before the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is available for review. Interested parties and the general public should have the draft EIS to compare with any proposed PSD. We ask that EPA delay final issuance of the permit until there is opportunity for comparison with the EIS. 2. EPA is required to consider whether a proposed facility plans to use the Best Available Control Technology (BACT) in its operations. Sithe is planning to construct two supercritical pulverized coal fired boilers. This is not the BACT. The BACT is Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) design, which is used at two other power plants in the U.S. and at plants elsewhere. In addition to reducing the amount of pollution emitted into the air, coal gasification uses coal more efficiently. EPA should require Sithe to use IGCC because it is BACT. 3. EPA is mandated to provide the highest degree of protection of air quality in Class One areas, which include Mesa Verde National Park. It appears that EPA has not considered the air quality monitoring data that is publicly available from the National Park Service Air Resources Division. EPA proposes to deal with its responsibility to provide the highest degree of protection by a side agreement with Sithe stating that it will assure visibility in Class One areas is protected. Side agreements are not legally enforceable. All such agreements should be legally enforceable conditions of any permits issued. When we visit Mesa Verde National Park, we can see the smoke stacks and plumes of the San Juan and Four Corners Power Plants through a brown haze, which obstructs the view to the south. Even the smallest amount of additional emissions from the proposed Desert Rock Plant will exacerbate an already unacceptable situation. The Dineh Power Company should not be permitted to build an additional plant until it cleans up the Four Corners plant, which is one of the dirtiest in the country. 4. Since there now is little monitoring of air quality in the Four Corners, EPA has scant data available to measure the current status of air quality or estimate whether Desert Rock will cause significant deterioration in that quality. Additional monitoring stations need to be established and maintained in areas like ours that are affected by emissions from power plants. If EPA permits the proposed plant to be constructed, it should require Sithe and Dineh Power to fund additional monitoring stations to assure that air quality is not further degraded. John H. and Judith A. Schuenemeyer [REDACTED] Cortez, CO 81321</p>
792	Jeanine Valdez	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant</p> <p>TEXT/COMMENTS: I do not feel that the EPA should issue a final permit on the Desert Rock Power Plant before the Environmental Impact Statement has been issued to the public and the public has had adequate time to respond to the Environmental Impact Statement. Thank you for your attention to this matter. Jeanine Valdez Citizen of Cortez, Colorado 81321 member of Cortez City Council</p>
793	Jeff Berman	<p>SUBJECT: Proposed Desert Rock Power Plant PSD Permit</p> <p>TEXT/COMMENTS: Jeffrey A. Berman 2401 Thomas Avenue Durango, CO 81301 Robert Baker Air Division (AIR-3), EPA, Region 9 75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, CA 94105-3901 Via email: desertrockairpermit@epa.gov Dear Mr. Baker: My name is Jeff Berman. I am an electrical engineer living in</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>Durango Colorado. I currently serve on the La Plata Electric Association Board of Directors, and am in the process of financing an oil extrusion and biodiesel production facility in the Four Corners area. With this background, I am reasonably familiar with not only the operational and air quality concerns associated with coal fired power plants, but also with the challenges in generating electricity for our society and the difficulties in financing multi-million dollar power generation infrastructure. Please consider my comments herein on the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant. These comments are made on behalf of myself and no other person or entity. I must unfortunately protest both EPA's proposed permit of the Desert Rock facility, as well as the process under which this permitting process is being considered. As part of my tenure at LPEA, I was privileged to attend several industry focused courses on electric generation infrastructure and power plant technology. Based on my questioning of several authorities on the issue at that time and through follow up communications, including several from the respected engineering and consulting firm of Black and Veatch, it is my understanding that IGCC technology is now or will be commercially viable within one to two years. Indeed, numerous of these power plants are in operation nation and worldwide. The key issue is not technology, but cost. If IGCC is actually an attainable technology, certainly within the time frame that any company may be able to finance, permit, engineer, and construct a power plant such as Desert Rock, it is then incumbent upon the EPA to take a stand against any political pressure, and permit nothing but IGCC with the potential for carbon sequestration. If this makes the economics of the proposed plant untenable, then so be it. The price of power will go up, and the public will pay for technology that genuinely protects the atmosphere locally and, with carbon sequestration options now being tested, our climate worldwide. Desert Rock or EPA may argue that BACT does not include IGCC. However, the EPA Pacific Southwest Region's Clear Air Act PSD brochure clearly states that BACT may include modification of the combustion process. I sincerely hope that EPA will take the high road on prevention of growing air quality impacts and state that IGCC is a requirement, rather than forcing lengthy judicial processes to make this determination. Reasonably accurate modeling is a pre-requisite in ensuring adherence to PSD standards as required by the CAA. Unfortunately, it appears that the air quality modeling performed for this permit failed to account for many sources of air quality impacts in the San Juan Basin. Indeed, other federal modeling of air quality in the region (i.e. BLM) appears to contradict the EPA's modeling. Meanwhile, I believe such modeling and permitting is premature as the EIS has not yet been published. The modeling appears flawed, lending itself to legal challenges that will in the end harm the proponent much moreso than ensuring adequate modeling in the first place. I must also protest the issuance of any permit that fails to address mercury and carbon emissions. For EPA to do anything less is a severe shortcoming. This is particularly important given that the Supreme Court is now taking up the issue of whether the EPA can legally regulate carbon emissions, in which case the agency may be required to do so. Even so, it is highly likely that carbon will be regulated through future legislation. Failure to incorporate these components into the permit would appear to be an unlawful segmentation of the permitting process. Next, I hear that mitigation measures are being proposed to minimize visibility impacts to Class 1 areas, yet are not actually part of the permit. Reading the proposed permit conditions (AZP 04-01) distributed at the EPA's Durango presentation in October, it appears that the control equipment and operations, as well as monitoring, are part of the permit</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>(Section IX.B.) I respectfully request that the EPA clarify what is required, and why some opponents believe that such mitigation is not being required as part of the permit. As you may intuit, I believe that EPA has an obligation to ensure that such mitigation measures are not only required, but enforced and effective. Without all of equipment requirements, monitoring, and enforcement authority (i.e. fines and/or shutdown capability sufficient to overcome any fiscal benefit of operating outside of permitted emissions), I would question EPA's capability to guarantee that such mitigation measures will actually end up being effective. Finally, it does not appear that EPA considered the cumulative economic affects of California's recently enacted requirements to purchase power solely from sources cleaner than natural gas fired power plants. Has the EPA identified to whom Desert Rock will sell power? Even if concrete markets for such power are identified outside California, generating stations in operation, construction, or planning today may no longer be able sell power into California. If this is the case, the economics of any pulverized coal fired power operation, including both planned (Desert Rock) and current facilities, will be less lucrative. This will make it more difficult for these plants to achieve BACT unless they achieve those California standards, which for coal means IGCC. If there is any standard for EPA to consider the financial capability of the proponent to meet the required PSD standards then, power plants that will not meet California's standards should be rejected by EPA through denial of PSD permits. I sincerely hope that the EPA will take a much stronger stand in protecting air quality than the current proposed permit suggests. Specifically, I request that the EPA: Â· extend the comment period until after the public has had adequate opportunity to review the forthcoming EIS, Â· require mitigation measures as part of the PSD permit, Â· revise the modeling to address all air quality impacts currently not incorporated into the modeling effort, Â· require IGCC, with the potential for carbon sequestration, as the best available control technology, Â· assess the cumulative economics of merchant plant power sales, especially considering California's recently adopted cleaner power requirements. Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to a considered response from EPA. Sincerely, /s/ Jeffrey A. Berman</p>
794	Jennie Akers	<p>SUBJECT: Deny permit for Sithe Global coal-fired power plant TEXT/COMMENTS: To whom it may concern, As a local resident of Montezuma County, Colorado, I am deeply concerned about the proposed permit for a new coal-fired power plant in northern New Mexico. I have personally witnessed the effect of the two existing power plants down valley on the local air quality. Though the two coal powered plants, already in operation in San Juan County south of us, may burn their coal at night, it creeps up the valley and appears as a brown morning haze between the base of the Sleeping Ute Mountain and the west cliffs of Mesa Verde. Not only does this pollution effect air quality and visibility, when the air is absorbed into rain clouds, it is then deposited into lakes and rivers and adversely effects regional water quality. We cannot afford to pollute water in such an arid climate and an agriculturally based economy. I disagree with the mining of coal and the destruction it causes to the landscape. Coal-mining is not respectful to the cultural values of the Navajo homeland. I would like to see future energy production focused on alternative energies, such as wind and solar, in the Four Corners where these alternative sources abound. I want the EPA to deny the Sithe Global permit. We do not want another coal-powered plant in New Mexico when the burning of coal has such far-reaching and detrimental effects to the economic resources on which we rely and air, land, and water quality. Please do not grant the permit to Sithe Global. Jennie Akers [REDACTED]</p>

Num ber		Notes
		Dolores, Colorado 81323
795	jennifer burns	SUBJECT: proposed desert rock power plant TEXT/COMMENTS: I oppose the construction of this power plant. I believe it is not in the best interests of the long-term health of the four corners area to build this plant. Instead, I believe that the EPA should work with local governments to find cleaner and more sustainable methods to address our energy needs. In particular I would like to see the EPA provide leadership in the areas of energy conservation, facility retrofitting for energy efficiency, improved sustainability of commercial and residential development and site planning, incentives for wind and solar power, and energy technology that is economically viable and available to individuals, and local cooperatives. I believe that the Desert Rock Power Plant is a status quo corporate response to meet energy demands ad infinitum. Instead, I want to see government help citizens reduce demand and find energy solutions that are smaller scale, more local and environmentally sound. EPA needs to help the four corners area address the demand side of the equation, rather than focussing only on the production of more energy that uses outdated and polluting technology. Want to be your own boss? Learn how on Yahoo! Small Business.
796	Jennifer Guy	SUBJECT: Proposed Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Hello, Our family is very much AGAINST the permitting of another power plant in the Four Corners area. The sky is already brown at the edges, fish are inedible from local lakes. Enough is enough! There are NO acceptable levels for adding more carbon dioxide, ozone, and mercury to our air. Sithe Global is a German company; they don't care about about air or health, just profits. Please say NO! Thank you. Jennifer Guy James Justice Marie Bennett [REDACTED] Durango CO 81301
797	jessey tase	SUBJECT: public comments TEXT/COMMENTS: Hello, I strongly urge you NOT to permit this power plant. The combined and cumulative impacts of this plant and others already operating in the area have a serious negative impact on the air quality of the four corners area. The dispersion modeling used for this permit application is insufficient to determine the impacts on local and regional air quality. A more in-depth, regionally accepted process should be followed to address this issue. The trading of pollution credits will further inhibit improving air quality in this area, as this "cleaner burning" plant could just trade it's pollution credits to other local less-clean burning plants. This should not be allowed as the impact to our area is TOO great. Also, this plant should not be allowed to burn most of its coal at night as other plants in the area do... this will help to show the actual impacts of our power (and thus coal) consumption. I urge you to PLEASE strongly reconsider the permittingof this power plant. The future of our air quality depends on it! Thank you for considering these comments in your written response. Jessey Tase Durango, CO Do you Yahoo!? Everyone is raving about the all-new Yahoo! Mail.
798	Michael Casey	SUBJECT: PUBLIC COMMENT RE: DESERT ROCK POWER PLANT TEXT/COMMENTS: Jan Holt [REDACTED] Durango, Colorado 81301 [REDACTED] 10/25/06 Dear Robert Baker, USEPA: I am opposed to the Desert Rock power plant for a number of reasons. First, more accurate analysis and readings of existing air quality are needed. The negative air quality impacts from our two present power plants and the many thousands of gas and coal facilities, combined with this proposed new plant, will be very detrimental for our area. And, I don't feel that your present studies are adequate. How can the project be evaluated if the draft EIS has not been released? Is there something you don't want the public to see, or is it being

Num ber		Notes
		<p>'revised'? Whatever the reason that this is being held from the public, it is obvious that the project can not be properly evaluated or go forward without it. I question the accuracy of pollution sources from existing readings as there were apparently not monitors at the proposed site in question. Any analysis or conclusions demand that cumulative impacts be included. Regardless of difficulties in protecting the monitoring of this area, or of 'opinions' about what monitors might show, again, the project can not be properly evaluated without having this analysis. Using data from sites farther away or with older information is not acceptable. It is clear that we soon will or already have problems with mercury, ozone, NO2, CO2, VOC's and dust, and that the Desert Rock plant would put us over the edge. Our health, public lands, wildlife, tourism, forests, agriculture, and healthy communities would suffer. Approval of the Desert Rock power plant should not go forward as the present analysis is both flawed and incomplete. Good, unbiased, complete analysis would show the plant to be inappropriate for this area. Sincerely, Michael Casey</p>
799	Jim Bolen	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear EPA: My comments and feeling about the new Desert Rock Power plant. This really sucks putting a third power plant at what was a pristine area which had the clearest and cleanest Air in the country. Have we not done our part in supplying the energy needs of this country with the two plants already? What regional needs is Sithe Global talking about? We are not part of the large cities to our south and west. However you cut it, we are not part of that region. Power plants should be built where the energy use is; such as the large cities where all this energy is going. They shouldn't have the right to export their pollution to pristine areas.. The dog and Pony show put on by the EPA ignored the pollution we already have from the existing plants and just talked like this plant as it was in a vacuum. Unfortunately we have too much pollution with the two dirty plants that contribute to our deteriorating air quality. EPA and Sithe Global put their own spin on the research conveniently ignoring certain pollutants when they talk about air quality. It is funny that the existing power plants are just now talking about reducing their pollution when this new proposal emerges. I am sorry; this makes me very cynical. Before we start any new plant; the existing plants should install the latest in technology first and we see the results first before we even consider a third plant. At that time and only at that time should a third plant be considered and only if ALL pollutants are significantly lower then our current existing levels of pollutants. ALL pollutants including mercury should meet the strict standards of a class 1 designation which is mandated to provide the highest degree of air quality protection. I don't know why it isn't taken into account that our Mesa Verde as a national park is already designated a class 1 area and should be receiving the highest protection. Jim Bolen [REDACTED]. Durango, Colo.</p>
800	Jim Herrick	<p>SUBJECT: build it in California TEXT/COMMENTS: The plant needs to be built in California with Californian air quality standards, since most of the power is going to them. Why must we breathe in their Mercury. Laura Herrick</p>
801	Jim Herrick	<p>SUBJECT: No plant TEXT/COMMENTS: You can already see the particle cloud that covers the 4 corners from outer space. Please take your power plant to California.</p>
802	JJ Colman	<p>SUBJECT: Re: FROM DURANGO TEXT/COMMENTS: REPLY: I have checked out your website, thank you. All the graphs and techno lingo is great information, but it still does NOT address the fact that building a coal burning power plant will be using a NON-RENEWAL RESOURCE !!! You look at all the</p>

Num ber		Notes
		<p>graphs and charts and tell me how burning something that we can not reproduce makes any sense at all. That is why I insist on being forward thinking and continue to develop technology that uses the sun & wind. The future of other developing nations have made great leaps in to these technologies to avoid their past mistakes. Why would our nation... "most advanced" in the world use a technology that would burn up the source and then what ?????????????????? Common sense here folks !!! That's all that is being requested. DO THE RIGHT THING, do not approve this permit. TO REPEAT MYSELF FROM MY ORIGINAL COMMENT: "You've got to be kidding yourselves if you think this is a good idea. Let's make steps to show other countries we too can make a positive difference. We've got a lot to do to clean up our mistakes... unfortunately all of them will not be able to be addressed in OUR LIFE TIME, this plant would only add to the mistake list !</p> <p>Thank you, Janise J Colman [REDACTED] Durango, CO 81301 DesertRockAirPermit@epamail.epa.gov wrote: Thank you for your public comment on this project. We will respond to all public comments after the public comment period closes on October 27th. You may wish to check our website at http://www.epa.gov/region09/air/permit/desertrock/index.html. From: JJ Colman To:DesertRockAirPermit@EPA 10/03/2006 02:04 Subject: FROM DURANGO PUBLIC COMMENT: Stop this NOW !! You've got to be kidding yourselves if you think this is a good idea. Pat yourselves on your back when you decide to use solar or wind as the alternative. The generations following sure will appreciate your forward thinking janise j colman [REDACTED] durango, co 81301 [REDACTED]</p>
803	JJ Colman	<p>SUBJECT: FROM DURANGO TEXT/COMMENTS: PUBLIC COMMENT: Stop this NOW !! You've got to be kidding yourselves if you think this is a good idea. Pat yourselves on your back when you decide to use solar or wind as the alternative. The generations following sure will appreciate your forward thinking janise j colman [REDACTED] durango, co 81301 [REDACTED]</p>
804	JJ Colman	<p>SUBJECT: Public comment TEXT/COMMENTS: For my children's children - DO NOT APPROVE THIS PERMIT !!</p>
805	Joanie Howland	<p>SUBJECT: objection TEXT/COMMENTS: I would like to object to the installation of the Desert Rock Power Plant. While I am aware that emissions from a coal power plant could be mostly clean, judging by the other power plants in the area and the lack supervision by the EPA in this regard, I dread the filth a new plant will certainly bring to the Four Corners area. Energy companies should be looking at alternative energy sources not building more coal fired power plants. I am the Director of the Cortez Public Library in Cortez, Colorado. I would like to point out to the EPA that our library received the notice of the local hearings about the power plant THE DAY BEFORE THEY BEGAN. Since some of the hearings were several hours drive away from Cortez, this notice should have been received much earlier. Perhaps the name of the Environmental PROTECTION (?) Agency needs to be changed to something more appropriate. Joanie Howland [REDACTED] Dolores, CO 81321</p>
806	John Hoover	<p>SUBJECT: TEXT/COMMENTS: I am writing to you in opposition to the desert rock power plant. I live in Cortez Co and over the last 15 years that I have lived here it seems that every year the haze gets worse. I think the EPA would better serve the people of the 4 corners by getting the two present power plants to install scrubbers and clean up the haze that they are putting in the air. After</p>

Number		Notes
		that is accomplished then is the time to talk about desert rock. Thanks for reading my e-mail. John Hoover [REDACTED] Cortez, Co 81321
807	Jonathan Rudolf	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: To the EPA: It is hard for me to believe that the EPA could approve a third coal generating power plant in the Four Corners area when the two existing plants are among the dirtiest in the country. As you know, after a recent lawsuit, the PNM company has finally agreed to clean up its Four Corners Power station. However, this clean-up has yet to happen. The APS plant has not even pledged to improve. Perhaps once the existing plants are retrofitted and proven to operate in an environmentally sensitive manner, you can revisit this application, but at the moment any improvement is only speculation. I should not have to tell this to the EPA, but there is nothing more important than clean air and clean water. Nothing. It is your duty to protect the air and water in this region and throughout the country. It is not your job to support the coal industry. I realize the current administration is downright hostile to environmental concerns when those concerns conflict with business, but you at the EPA presumably went into a career in environmental protection because you had some thoughts of actually protecting the environment. I simply ask you to do what you are supposed to do. If you look at the current air quality of this region objectively, you cannot possibly endorse a further fouling of the air with another coal burning plant. I ask you to deny a permit for the Desert Rock power plant at this time. Should the day come that the existing plants are cleaner and the local air quality better, then the petitioners may reapply. Until then, this area's environment cannot support a third plant. Jonathan Rudolf [REDACTED] Farmington, NM 87401-8615 email [REDACTED]</p>
808	joshua jones	<p>SUBJECT: questions and comments TEXT/COMMENTS: Joshua Jones [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Cortez, CO 81321 To Whom It May Concern at the EPA: I am writing in response to the proposed Desert Rock Energy Project. Meetings were held in Arizona, New Mexico, and Colorado. Why weren't meetings held in southeastern Utah? Visibility at national parks in the four corners region will certainly be adversely affected by pollutants from additional power plants in the area. Since Sithe's initial modeling of visibility using the Federal Land Manager modeling guidelines indicated that visibility would be adversely affected, the EPA has an obligation under the Clean Air Act to insure that visibility issues are addressed using sound scientific methods and taking into account all existing contributing factors to air quality and visibility. Has additional proper modeling been applied to Desert Rock? Is the Air Quality Dispersion Modeling Analysis for Desert Rock accurate? What is the background monitoring data for the Desert Rock project? How does the EPA plan to comply with the Clean Air Mercury Rule (2005)? Given that the existing two coal fired-power plants in the area are above the mercury emissions cap, how is a third power plant going to reduce the total amount of mercury being released? Mercury levels in nearby water sources including the San Juan River, Navajo Reservoir, Lake Farmington, Narraguinnep Reservoir, and McPhee Reservoir are already high. In fact, fish consumption advisories have already been issued for all of these water sources. How does Desert Rock plan to comply with Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations." Compliance with this executive order is required in cases where disproportionate exposure to pollutants, and potential health problems (e.g., respiratory) is of concern (USEPA Air Quality Impact Report, NSR 4-1-3, AZP 04-01). The Environmental Protection Agency is obligated to protect the air quality of the Four Corners region. Why is such a dense concentration of power plants being allowed in the region? Without any</p>

Num ber		Notes
		known customers for this power, is another global warming causing power plant advisable or necessary? Ultimately, who is going to pay for the hidden health care costs created by the pollutants from Desert Rock? Sincerely, Joshua Jones Stay in touch with old friends and meet new ones with Windows Live Spaces
809	Joyce Grimm	SUBJECT: Desert Rock polution TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Mr. Baker, Since we already have the dubious distinction of having the worst air quality in the entire state of New Mexico I find it very disturbing that we are to be stuck with another power plant. No number of jobs are worth our poor air quality getting even worse. Sincerely, Joyce Grimm Farmington, NM
810	Joyce Long Stevenson	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Madam or Sir: I'd like to voice my NO vote for the Desert Rock Power Plant 25 miles southwest of Shiprock. As it is there are too many days when a yellow haze obscures the view to the south from my home of Cortez, Colorado. I hate to think of the chemical composition of that haze, and what it is doing to the health of those of us in the area. I strongly recommend that no permit for this plant be approved; our air quality can't stand it. Joyce Long Stevenson [REDACTED] Cortez CO 81321-9408 [REDACTED]
811	Julia Zlitni	SUBJECT: desertrock power plant and land on Burnham New Mexico TEXT/COMMENTS: The issue and subject is about the land my grandparents and my mother and father's home. We grew up living on this desert land. After, Kit Carson died. Sherman let the few people who survived the prison camp in Fort Sumner walk back to reservation. My great grandmother started her life again here and we are the 5th generation since my grandmother came back from Fort Sumner prison camp. We have been called squaw and I love to hate the word squaw. That is what the white men called us all our lives and now you want to build a power plant in our backyard. I don't like your ways and the air permit for emission testing is a very good idea. I see alot of pollution in our community. The air we inhale and exhale is getting very contaminated by these near by power plants. The children, animals and every other four legged habitats breathe the air. Emission test and the Safety issues and environment issues are good. Most of us Native American Women been called squaw even when we go to Farmington to shop and when we go to school. Building a Power plant is a issue. White men needs to watch their mouth. We lived in this country before Immigrants moved here because they were running from their own countries. We have no place to run. Our skin is red and our hair our black and I can speak your language too. Anmesty is white men immigration status in this country. Try the next generation of search with Windows Live Search today! http://imagine-windowslive.com/minisites/searchlaunch/?locale=en-us&source=hmtagline
812	juliette jackson	SUBJECT: No to new power plant!!!! TEXT/COMMENTS: Everyone is raving about the all-new Yahoo! Mail (http://advision.webevents.yahoo.com/mailbeta/)
813	Michael Casey	SUBJECT: Protect our air - TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Sirs: I live in the Four Corners region of Colorado and am a Wilderness Guide who spends a lot of time in the mountains with vast views of the increasing haze in the atmosphere due primarily to coal burning power plants. This is a major problem that will not get any better and is guaranteed to get much worse if the Desert Rock plant is allowed to be built as planned. We need to start creating new, clean energy resources and not using coal. Energy conservation is very much lacking in our society, and a denial of this permit would make a stong message about embracing reduction of waste and spending our electricity dollars on new, clean technology. Please deny this permit and start admitting to the coal

Number		Notes
		industry that they need to bring you plans with much stricter emissions controls for the good of all Americans and the ecosystem upon which we rely on to create our wealth. Thank you, Michael Casey [REDACTED] Ridgway CO 81432
814	Kendall Baker	<p>SUBJECT: desert rock permit TEXT/COMMENTS: >> October 27, 2006 >> Hello Robert Baker and EPA, >> I'm writing to voice my complete opposition to the proposed desert >> rock coal plant. >> This plant will contribute to global warming and pollute the >> surrounding air quality with mercury, sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen >> oxides. Following are questions I have: >> Given that the San Juan Generating Station and Four Corners Power >> Plant are well documented as two of the major polluting power plants >> in the U.S., why does the EPA consider the adjacent siting of Desert >> Rock appropriate? What about SOx, CO and NOx emissions? >> Please explain, specifically, the methodology used for the air >> quality modeling. Why were monitors in Farmington, New Mexico and >> Rio Rancho, New Mexico used for background concentrations of >> pollutants in the modeling for Desert Rock, rather than local >> monitors near the project site south of Shiprock? What was done in >> the modeling to analyze cumulative air quality impacts? >> Given the documented health advisories in the region for Mercury, >> how does the EPA plan on complying with the Clean Air Mercury Rule >> (2005) to permanently limit and reduce mercury emissions from >> coal-fired power plants? How are mercury advisories affecting Navajo >> Lake, McPhee Reservoir, the San Juan River, and Vallecito Lake. >> Given that ozone levels in the Farmington, New Mexico area may >> soon exceed ozone limits and that nitrogen oxides are a necessary >> component in the formation of ozone, how will Desert Rock affect >> ozone levels in the Four Corners region? >> Given the growing consensus about global warming caused by carbon >> dioxide (CO2) emissions, and the likelihood that CO2 will be >> regulated in the near future, how can EPA ignore the vast >> contribution to global warming caused by Desert Rock? >> Why is the EPA allowing the high concentration of power plants in >> the Four Corners region degrading public health and quality of life? >> What will occur to visibility in Class I areas like Mesa Verde >> National Park and Weminuche Wilderness? >> Does the Draft Air Permit take into account non-stationary air >> quality effects (including projected fugitive dust) associated with >> the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant? How are the non-stationary and >> stationary air quality impacts of the Desert Rock Power Plant >> evaluated cumulatively? >> Environmental Justice >> How does Desert Rock comply with Executive Order 12898, "Federal >> Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and >> Low-Income Populations?" Compliance with Environmental Justice is >> required for the Air Quality permit, where issues of concern include, >> "Disproportionate exposure to pollutants, potential health problems >> (respiratory, heavy metals in fish)." >> EIS/Draft Air Quality Permit >> How can the Draft Air Quality Permit be evaluated when the Draft >> Environmental Impact Statement for the entire project has yet to be >> released? Why does the comment period for the air quality permit >> close (October 27, 2006) before the Draft EIS is released to the >> public later this year? >> How does the public know that the entire proposed Desert Rock >> project and associated infrastructure is incorporated and evaluated >> in the proposed Air Quality Permit? >> Where will the power generated by Desert Rock be transmitted to >> and what will be the associated air quality impacts? >> Modeling >> Has the proper modeling been applied to the analysis of Desert >> Rock? >> What is the background monitoring data for the Desert Rock >> project, such as for ammonia, and how is it applied to the PSD permit >> in the analysis of Best Available Control Technology? >> Air</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>quality will worsen and mammalian life will suffer from the >> poisons spewed by this plant. EPA must NOT permit a plant which will >> further injure the earth and all who breathe! NO COAL PLANT! >> thank you for your attention, >> Kendall Baker >> [REDACTED] >> Durango, CO 81301 >> All-in-one security and maintenance for your PC. Get a free 90-day >> trial! >> http://clk.atdmt.com/MSN/go/msnnkwlo0050000002msn/direct/01/? >> href=http://www.windowsonecare.com/?sc_cid=msn_hotmail > All-in-one security and maintenance for your PC. Get a free 90-day > trial! > http://clk.atdmt.com/MSN/go/msnnkwlo0050000002msn/direct/01/? > href=http://www.windowsonecare.com/?sc_cid=msn_hotmail</p>
815	Kent Ford	<p>SUBJECT: written testimony TEXT/COMMENTS: Kent Ford [REDACTED] ~ Durango, CO, 81301 ~ USA Phone [REDACTED] ~ Email [REDACTED] October 4, 2006 re: Desert Rock air permit To whom it may concern: Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Our southwest Colorado community relies on being different than other communities, that is what attracts the tourists! So I was particularly disturbed to hear an EPA spokesperson (EPA R 9 Colleen McKaughan) quoted as saying the air in this area is so clean it can absorb additional pollutants without harm. This shows a fundamental lack of understanding of the local economies. Nearly all of our major reservoirs have mercury warnings, and it took years of lawsuits to enforce current regulations against the current power plants. A bond to fund lawsuits to fight for exceedances should be posted before construction is allowed to begin. Global warming is posing a great threat to our contry, and the air quality permit should not be rushed to get ahead of the quickly evolving science on global warming. Apply the precautionary principle, first do no harm! If construction is allowed, the power plant should be required to purchase carbon offsets to mitigate their damages. Sincerely, Kent Ford Kent Ford [REDACTED] [REDACTED] www.performancevideo.com www.wwsymposium.com OCTOBER 2006, Don't miss it!</p>
816	William D. Hunt and Kim Hunt	<p>SUBJECT: clean air TEXT/COMMENTS: Please do not allow a permit for Desert Rock Power Plant. We already have so much pollution that has resulted in an inordinate amount of lung problems and cancers. The jobs it would provide do not outweigh the risks and damage to our environment. Thank you, William D. Hunt Kim Hunt</p>
817	Larry Alba	<p>SUBJECT: Please Deny the Desert Rock Power Plant Permit TEXT/COMMENTS: Protest Letter to Stop the Power Plant EPA, I am Larry Alba, a New Mexico Land Owner of about 300 properties. Will you kindly, please find legal reasons to Deny the Air Permit for this new unnecessary Power Plant. Many Scientists unanimously agree that Coal Burning Power Plants are by Far the Most Polluting forms of Air Pollution in the whole world!! I am very mad because the EPA and the New Mexico Environment Department sell / then give-out "Air Pollution Permits" to practically every company who applies, if the applicant does all of the extensive- expensive paperwork and the so-called "Computer Modeling" to go along with the plans. This is a Bad Joke on all of the People in America people who you are supposed to protect ! No Computer is going to tell me a safe amount of pollution for the Navajo People and other Americans to be contaminated with! I know that the final permit that is usually issued by NMED Air Q Bureau only states " That the Pollution estimated figures are only an estimate, and these are Not Enforceble limits. Does the EPA give out this type of open-ended massive polluting permits too? This World is supposed to last for millions of years for the future generations of people to enjoy. No people should now be allowed to destroy the beautiful blue</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>skys with thousands of tons of air pollution per year and destroy the rivers, lakes, dirt soil and drinking water with such things as Mercury and many other pollutants. Excuse my language, but the Environment in this world is "Going to Hell Fast" because of Greedy Polluting Companies such as the foreign Sithe Global Company who wants to take advantage of the Low Income Navajo American People to bring in their Global Warming and Polluting Power Plant. I also wish to say that these poor uneducated Native Americans obviously have reelected a BAD President who only cares about money, not good environment first. Why didn't he call and welcome Solar and Wind Power Investment Companies instead? I will call and ask him about this. I guess you haven't heard the latest news at the North Pole, about the Ice Pack that is quickly melting by over 40% in the last 20+ years according to US Satellite Photos. The Polar Bears do not have a place to go, or food to eat because of this man-made disaster! These Polar Bears are now forced to be eating each other as cannibals!! Please help save our Earth from this Destruction. I sure hope that this project will be Stopped NOW! Sincerely, Larry Alba [REDACTED] Jarales, New Mexico 87023</p>
818	Larry Berger	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: I am very much against the setting of the Desert Rock Power Plant, it seems you are using the Four Corners Area as a sacrifice area. There are so many things wrong with putting ANOTHER plant in this area from our air and life quality, the exceeding of ozone limits, contribution to global warming, heavy metals in our lakes, cumulative air quality impacts; just to mention a few problems. Once this plant is here it will be hard to take it off line; we DO NOT want this plant. What we want you (EPA) to do as protectors of our air and water, is to clean up the two plants already spreading the deadly brown haze and NOT let the building of another plant! Power at any cost is not the answer and profits over health of our citizens is certainly not the answer. The EPA should be pro-active on sponsoring clean energy, not rehashing old energy sources that pollute our area and lower our quality of life. NO on Desert Rock! Larry Berger [REDACTED] Co. 81321 [REDACTED]</p>
819	Larry Eads	<p>SUBJECT: Comments TEXT/COMMENTS: I write as a citizen and resident of the Four Corners region in opposition to the issuance of a permit for the Desert Rock power plant near Shiprock, NM. My opposition is based primarily on two issues: " The air quality in the Four Corners area is not "...so clean that it can absorb additional pollutants without harm" (Colleen McKaughan, EPA, Region 9). There is obvious, visible pollution in the skies in the Four Corners area as evidenced by the yellow/brown sky coloration on an almost daily basis. Visibility in areas like Mesa Verde National Park and the Weminuche Wilderness area is severely restricted. Mercury health advisories have been issued for Vallecito Lake in our area with the apparent source being airborne deposition. It seems to me that any additional pollution will be harmful, especially if pollution from nearby existing coal-fired plants and the substantial pollution contributed by the natural gas industry in the area is taken into account. " The Desert Rock plant is projected to add 13.7 million tons of carbon dioxide annually to the atmosphere. This clearly exacerbates the carbon dioxide build-up that underlies global climate change. We are at a point when we should be looking for ways to reduce the carbon dioxide load, not adding to it. The EPA should not approve the Desert Rock permit unless and until the owners (Sithe Global or its successors) agree to build a state of the art non-polluting plant with carbon dioxide recapture and sequestration. The technology for that type of plant is available. We cannot afford to have the additional pollution added to our already stressed atmosphere and we cannot</p>

Number		Notes
		afford to allow additional carbon dioxide to be released. There are other alternatives to the Desert Rock plant proposal. The consensus of the citizens of the Four Corners area is that the Desert Rock permit should be denied. Thank you. Larry D. Eads [REDACTED] Durango, CO 81301
820	Larry Hartzke	SUBJECT: Comment on Desert Rock Proposal TEXT/COMMENTS: I oppose the construction of the Desert Rock power plant because I am concerned that Montezuma County Colorado already receives too much airborne mercury and haze. Levels of rain-borne mercury in Mesa Verde Nat. Park are very high. This project should not proceed unless and until a credible study of mercury in the air of SW Colorado is conducted. In addition, abundant haze is usually visible from Montezuma County to the south (and lower in elevation) in the direction of Shiprock NM. Haze created by the Desert Rock power plant will only add to the haze problem in the Four Corners area. The project should not proceed until these issues are resolved. Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments. Larry Hartzke Mancos, CO
821	lars holbek	SUBJECT: NO PERMIT FOR DESERT ROCK COAL PLANT! TEXT/COMMENTS: October 26, 2006 Hello Robert Baker and EPA, I'm writing to voice my complete opposition to the proposed desert rock coal plant. This plant will contribute to global warming and pollute the surrounding air quality with mercury, sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen oxides. Following are questions I have: Given that the San Juan Generating Station and Four Corners Power Plant are well documented as two of the major polluting power plants in the U.S., why does the EPA consider the adjacent siting of Desert Rock appropriate? What about SOx, CO and NOx emissions? Please explain, specifically, the methodology used for the air quality modeling. Why were monitors in Farmington, New Mexico and Rio Rancho, New Mexico used for background concentrations of pollutants in the modeling for Desert Rock, rather than local monitors near the project site south of Shiprock? What was done in the modeling to analyze cumulative air quality impacts? Given the documented health advisories in the region for Mercury, how does the EPA plan on complying with the Clean Air Mercury Rule (2005) to permanently limit and reduce mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants? How are mercury advisories affecting Navajo Lake, McPhee Reservoir, the San Juan River, and Vallecito Lake. Given that ozone levels in the Farmington, New Mexico area may soon exceed ozone limits and that nitrogen oxides are a necessary component in the formation of ozone, how will Desert Rock affect ozone levels in the Four Corners region? Given the growing consensus about global warming caused by carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions, and the likelihood that CO2 will be regulated in the near future, how can EPA ignore the vast contribution to global warming caused by Desert Rock? Why is the EPA allowing the high concentration of power plants in the Four Corners region degrading public health and quality of life? What will occur to visibility in Class I areas like Mesa Verde National Park and Weminuche Wilderness? Does the Draft Air Permit take into account non-stationary air quality effects (including projected fugitive dust) associated with the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant? How are the non-stationary and stationary air quality impacts of the Desert Rock Power Plant evaluated cumulatively? Environmental Justice How does Desert Rock comply with Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations?" Compliance with Environmental Justice is required for the Air Quality permit, where issues of concern include, "Disproportionate exposure to pollutants, potential health problems (respiratory, heavy metals in fish)." EIS/Draft Air Quality Permit How can the Draft Air Quality Permit be evaluated

Number		Notes
		<p>when the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the entire project has yet to be released? Why does the comment period for the air quality permit close (October 27, 2006) before the Draft EIS is released to the public later this year? How does the public know that the entire proposed Desert Rock project and associated infrastructure is incorporated and evaluated in the proposed Air Quality Permit? Where will the power generated by Desert Rock be transmitted to and what will be the associated air quality impacts? Modeling Has the proper modeling been applied to the analysis of Desert Rock? What is the background monitoring data for the Desert Rock project, such as for ammonia, and how is it applied to the PSD permit in the analysis of Best Available Control Technology? Air quality will worsen and mammalian life will suffer from the poisons spewed by this plant. EPA must NOT permit a plant which will further injure the earth and all who breathe! NO COAL PLANT! thank you for your attention, Lars Holbek [REDACTED] Durango, CO 81302 All-in-one security and maintenance for your PC. Get a free 90-day trial! http://clk.atdmt.com/MSN/go/msnnkwlo0050000002msn/direct/01/?href=http://www.windowsonecare.com/?sc_cid=msn_hotmail</p>
822	Laura Chee	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Permit Comments TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Sir, I was not able to attend the public hearings, but as a member of the Navajo tribe I am opposed to the air permit issued by EPA Region 9. We are opposed to the air quality standards used from Albuquerque NM rather than the location of where the two power plants are presently located. These two power plants are the worst polluters in the country. Adding another power plant is risking the health of thousands of Navajo people. Maybe you people don't care about the minority people, and don't care if they die from bronchial diseases. Your agency is suppose to be concerned with the health of the senior citizens, children and people who have no electricity or running water available to them. They don't have millions of dollars to line your pockets, but it is still your responsibility to protect their health and environment from dangerous politicians, power utility companies and dangerous environmental pollutants. The power utility companies and Joe Shirley Jr. don't care about the citizens of the U.S. They prefer to line their pockets with millions of dollars. Laura Chee Vice President of C-Aquifer for DINE [REDACTED] Leupp AZ 86035 Do You Yahoo!? Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around http://mail.yahoo.com</p>
823	laura john	<p>SUBJECT: comment TEXT/COMMENTS: I don't think they should build another power plant. There are already two power plants in the area and there is enough pollution in the air. If you build another power plant the region is going to look like Los Angeles with all the smog. Yes, there will be employment but at what cost? The environmental quality of the air should really be heavily considered. Do You Yahoo!? Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around http://mail.yahoo.com</p>
824	Lee White	<p>SUBJECT: Proposed Desert Rock Power plant TEXT/COMMENTS: I am writing to strongly oppose the construction of yet another polluting power plant in my neighborhood knowing full well that it is a done deal. Having worked for three different governmental agencies in my earlier life I am aware of the "obligatory" meetings and comment periods and how directives "from above" trump the views of the citizens and common sense. Hopefully, someone at EPA will take the concerns and health of the people in consideration of this matter of grave concern. Why not allow this project to move forward with the caveat that the COMBINATION of all three power plants in the Four Corners area be LESS than that presently being emitted by the presently existing ones?</p>

Number		Notes
		Talk is cheap. Use Yahoo! Messenger to make PC-to-Phone calls. Great rates starting at 1¢/min.
825	Linda Robinson	SUBJECT: desert rock air permit. TEXT/COMMENTS: To whom it may concern: I do not support a permit for a new coal fired power plant. More air-born pollution from such a facility will only contribute to our current problem of the presence of toxic mercury in our lakes and waterways. The particulate dispersion in our landscape causes this problem and likely more that aren't yet studied or understood. The present way of determining how much pollution can be released into our skies through "dispersion modeling" is insufficient to determine the impacts on local and regional air quality. Our air quality is already heavily impacted by the existing power plants in the area. The fact this facility will have an opportunity to trade pollution credits with other regional facilities seems like it will mean that we will see worse air quality, not better. Please do not issue a permit for the Desert Rock Coal Fired Power Plant. Linda Robinson [REDACTED], Dolores, CO 81323
826	Lisa Dent	SUBJECT: Opposition to the Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Hello, I am writing to today to express my opposition to the proposed Desert Rock Coal Fired Power Plant. My reasons to oppose this proposed source of electricity include: health of the people living downwind from the emissions; the mercury levels that have accumulated in fisheries due to existing coal plants in the area; air quality and environmental changes that are now measurable and visible in Mesa Verde National Park and the Four Corners region and last but not least, economic issues that this proposed new plant presents. Economic issues include: The Four Corners is largely dependent on Tourism. A reduction in sub-urban air quality, quality of aquatic habitat, forest ecosystems and related services that serve the billion dollar tourist industry in our region would have a negative economic impact. The City Council of Durango, CO have recently voted unanimously to adopt the Mayor's Climate Protection Agreement. We join 319 other cities in the US that represent over 50 million people. A new Coal Fired Power Plant would be contradictory to this City wide and potentially County wide effort. Reduced health for the Four Corners inhabitants carries an immeasurable cost. Our nation is indisputably experiencing a health care crisis. The EPA, a branch of the federal government should not be in a position to support this proposed health hazard. This plant is dependent on selling it's energy. If the state of California refuses to purchase electricity from this source because it does not satisfy it's emission standards, how long will it be before AZ and NV adopt the same standards? Why are these standards acceptable to the EPA when they are not acceptable to thousands of people who have spoken out against this? I would like to know how the EPA is involved in proactive education to help the consumer understand the consequences of wasting energy? I feel this effort would have a nationally quantifiable positive affect. Perhaps I could find a way to assist with this public education. I understand that this is "cheap" energy, but this is old technology that will soon need to be retrofitted with even greater emissions controls. This is not a good investment. Thank you for your time and I look forward to your input. Lisa Dent
827	Lisa Matthews	SUBJECT: Fw: Desert Rock Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Mr Baker: Below is a copy of an email I recently sent to you. I do want to make it clear that I in no way was attempting to represent Mercy Regional Medical Center. The opinions stated are purely my own. I was merely trying to emphasize my medical background. Thanks once again, Lisa Matthews ----- Original Message ----- From: Lisa Matthews To: desertrockairpermit@epa.gov Sent: Thursday,

Number		Notes
		<p>September 21, 2006 7:45 PM Subject: Desert Rock Plant Hello Mr. Baker: I am writing from Durango, Colorado to tell you that I strongly oppose the Desert Rock coal plant for these reasons: 1) Even though this plant will have cleaner technology, it is still not a renewable energy source and still will pollute our planet. Let's focus on building plants of wind, solar, etc. The southwest has so much sun and is a perfect place for a solar powered plant. We already have some wind power. Let's build more of these. 2) I read that the energy produced from the Desert Rock plant is to be used for Las Vegas? If this is the case, I am appalled that this wasteful city does not build it's own plant in Nevada. Why should we have to deal with the pollution which results from energizing a place that abuses this earth's resources? 3) I've read that an EPA spokesperson said that the air in the southwest is so clean and that this area can absorb more pollutants. That is an outrage. We should be focusing on how to make our air cleaner still, not saying that it can take in more dirt. 4) Air is not the only thing this plant will make dirtier. Has the EPA looked at the fact that all our lakes and streams already have high contents of mercury? Another coal plant will only increase these levels. 5) The four corners region's waters are also high in heavy metal contamination from all the mining that has occurred over the years. We are also exposed to the radioactivity from a former superfund site. We are exposed to so many carcinogens here - our water doesn't even meet federal regulations Have there been studies to see what the combination effect from all these other sources of pollution would be with the added pollution from the Desert Rock plant? I bet this has not even been figured into the equation. I don't want more mercury in my water. I do not want to be exposed to more air pollution (in addition to the dirty air from our coal powered train in town - which SHOULD be converted to cleaner energy as nostalgia is not an excuse to pollute). I do not want to expose my body to more pollutants in this environment that has already suffered greatly from previous abuses. Thank you, Lisa Matthews, CT (ASCP) Pathology Dept. (yes, I, along with our pathologists, diagnose the cancers in our town) Mercy Regional Medical Center</p>
828	Lisa Matthews	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Original Message ----- From: Lisa Matthews To: desertrockairpermit@epa.gov Sent: Thursday, September 21, 2006 7:45 PM Subject: Desert Rock Plant Hello Mr. Baker: I am writing from Durango, Colorado to tell you that I strongly oppose the Desert Rock coal plant for these reasons: 1) Even though this plant will have cleaner technology, it is still not a renewable energy source and still will pollute our planet. Let's focus on building plants of wind, solar, etc. The southwest has so much sun and is a perfect place for a solar powered plant. We already have some wind power. Let's build more of these. 2) I read that the energy produced from the Desert Rock plant is to be used for Las Vegas? If this is the case, I am appalled that this wasteful city does not build it's own plant in Nevada. Why should we have to deal with the pollution which results from energizing a place that abuses this earth's resources? 3) I've read that an EPA spokesperson said that the air in the southwest is so clean and that this area can absorb more pollutants. That is an outrage. We should be focusing on how to make our air cleaner still, not saying that it can take in more dirt. 4) Air is not the only thing this plant will make dirtier. Has the EPA looked at the fact that all our lakes and streams already have high contents of mercury? Another coal plant will only increase these levels. 5) The four corners region's waters are also high in heavy metal contamination from all the mining that has occurred over the years. We are also exposed to the radioactivity from a former superfund site. We are exposed to so many carcinogens here - our water doesn't even meet</p>

Number		Notes
		federal regulations. Have there been studies to see what the combination effect from all these other sources of pollution would be with the added pollution from the Desert Rock plant? I bet this has not even been figured into the equation. I don't want more mercury in my water. I do not want to be exposed to more air pollution (in addition to the dirty air from our coal powered train in town - which SHOULD be converted to cleaner energy as nostalgia is not an excuse to pollute). I do not want to expose my body to more pollutants in this environment that has already suffered greatly from previous abuses. Thank you, Lisa Matthews, CT (ASCP) Pathology Dept. (yes, I, along with our pathologists, diagnose the cancers in our town) Mercy Regional Medical Center
829	Lisa Matthews	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Hello Mr. Baker: I am writing from Durango, Colorado to tell you that I strongly oppose the Desert Rock coal plant for these reasons: 1) Even though this plant will have cleaner technology, it is still not a renewable energy source and still will pollute our planet. Let's focus on building plants of wind, solar, etc. The southwest has so much sun and is a perfect place for a forward thinking solar plant. 2) I read that the energy produced from the Desert Rock plant is to be used for Las Vegas? If this is the case, I am appalled that this wasteful city does not build it's own plant in Nevada. Why should we have to deal with the pollution which results energizing a place that abuses this earth's resources? 3) I've read that an EPA spokesperson said that the air in the southwest is so clean and that this area can absorb more pollutants. That is an outrage. We should be focusing on how to make our air cleaner still, not saying that it can take in more dirt. 4) Air is not the only thing this plant will make dirtier. Has the EPA looked at the fact that all our lakes and streams already have high contents of mercury? Another coal plant will only increase these levels. 5) The four corners region's waters are also high in heavy metal contamination from all the mining that has occurred over the years. We are also exposed to the radioactivity from a former superfund site. We are exposed to so many carcinogens here - our water doesn't even meet federal regulations. Have there been studies to see what the combination effect from all these other sources of pollution would be with the added pollution from the Desert Rock plant? I bet this has not even been figured into the equation. I don't want more mercury in my water. I do not want to be exposed to more air pollution (in addition to the dirty air from our coal powered train in town - which SHOULD be converted to cleaner energy as nostalgia is not an excuse to pollute). I do not want to expose my body to more pollutants in this environment that has already suffered greatly from previous abuses. Thank you, Lisa Matthews, CT (ASCP) Pathology Dept. (yes, I, along with our pathologists, diagnose the cancers in our town) Mercy Regional Medical Center
830	Lisa Self	SUBJECT: NO to Desert Rock TEXT/COMMENTS: Hello Deciders of my Future, Please, please, NO new power plant. I do not want another power plant in my area. The air quality has already gone downhill in the 13 years I have lived in Durango, Colorado. I moved here for clean fresh mountain air. Please don't ruin this any further. Clean up the mess that is already here. Lisa Self [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Durango, CO 81301 [REDACTED]
831	Lora White	SUBJECT: desert rock project TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Sirs: Our U.S. Representative John Salazar is hearing strong opposition for the proposed Desert Rock Project for good reason. The existing coal-fired power plants are taking a toll on our community by deteriorating our quality of life through mercury pollution. I live ten miles from Vallecito Reservoir and the newly

Number		Notes
		posted mercury advisory has angered many people. To build another coal-fired power plant, even one touted to be the cleanest, will only increase airborne pollution in an area that is downwind and receives an unfair share. If the Desert Rock power plant is to be constructed, communities should have the guarantee that the coal-fired power plants near Shiprock will be closed. Any further increase in air pollution above already excessive contamination levels is unacceptable. Darren White Bayfield, CO [REDACTED]
832	Ischaefer	SUBJECT: desert rock TEXT/COMMENTS: Please allow me to express my dissatisfaction on the approval process for the coal plant planned for the Four Corners Area. As a long term resident of Colorado I have witnessed firsthand the overall decline in air quality in the Farmington and Shiprock areas of New Mexico. I cannot believe that more emissions of airborne toxic waste will go unnoticed, and will only add to the brown cloud that is already visible from 100 miles away. Is this the environmental impact we want to leave to our children and their children? Please consider looking into alternative sources of power that have less long term side effects, that show we care about becoming a steward of the earth. The coal plant is a short term solution to a long term need that saddles future generations with the need to restore balance. Thank you for the chance to express my opinion. Lynne Schaefer
833	Margaret Ackerman	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Coal-Fired Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: To whom it may concern: We have lived on a 7000 foot mesa for 35 years , we farm. Looking west as the brown haze creeps across the landscape more and more everyday is very disconcerting. The sunsets are an interesting color...if you like being scared! Please do not permit another coal-fired power plant in this 4Corners area. The proposal to build a new plant concerns us gravely. this is not common sense being used here....money is speaking.....Margaret Ackerman...Ignacio, Colorado Yahoo! Messenger with Voice. Make PC-to-Phone Calls to the US (and 30+ countries) for 2¢/min or less.
834	Margaret Pacheco	SUBJECT: Against dirty coal I am a resident TEXT/COMMENTS: Care of: Robert Baker Air 3, Mr Baker and to other whom this concernsI have been a resident of La Plata County for 32 years. In that time I fished and waded in the rivers and let my children play in the water and eventually taught them the beauty of fishing. I di not know I was exposing them to high mercury levels. What a cruel trick. I myself have high mercury levels in my body and have the mystery illnesses that were so hard to diagnose. Will you be paying for my medical care? And if not can you refer me to the right people responsible for my having high levels of toxic metals in my system? I would like help in paying for the care I will need. And when my daughter at age 22 was diagnosed with possible breast cancer I did wonder if that wonderful beauty of the natural world we taught her was another cruel joke. Please consider all of it. Margaret Pacheco. > SPEAK OUT AGAINST DIRTY COAL > Background: > Sithe Global Energy is proposing to build the 1500-megawatt Desert Rock coal-fired power plant near you! This plant will contribute to global warming and pollute the surrounding air quality with mercury, sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen oxides. Join us at the upcoming public hearings and speak out against dirty coal! > Emissions > * Given that the San Juan Generating Station and Four Corners Power Plant are well documented as two of the major polluting power plants in the U.S., why does the EPA consider the adjacent siting of Desert Rock appropriate? What about SOx, CO and NOx emissions? > * Ask the EPA to recite, specifically, the methodology used for the air quality modeling. Why were monitors in Farmington, New Mexico and Rio Rancho, New Mexico used for background concentrations of pollutants in the modeling for Desert Rock,

Number		Notes
		<p>rather than local monitors near the project site south of Shiprock? What was done in the modeling to analyze cumulative air quality impacts? > * Given the documented health advisories in the region for Mercury, how does the EPA plan on complying with the Clean Air Mercury Rule (2005) to permanently limit and reduce mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants? Ask the EPA how mercury advisories are affecting Navajo Lake, McPhee Reservoir, the San Juan River, and Vallecito Lake. > * Given that ozone levels in the Farmington, New Mexico area may soon exceed ozone limits and that nitrogen oxides are a necessary component in the formation of ozone, how will Desert Rock affect ozone levels in the Four Corners region? > * Given the growing consensus about global warming caused by carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions, and the likelihood that CO2 will be regulated in the near future, how can EPA ignore the vast contribution to global warming caused by Desert Rock? > * Why is the EPA allowing the high concentration of power plants in the Four Corners region degrading public health and quality of life? > * What will occur to visibility in Class I areas like Mesa Verde National Park and Weminuche Wilderness? > * Does the Draft Air Permit take into account non-stationary air quality effects (including projected fugitive dust) associated with the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant? How are the non-stationary and stationary air quality impacts of the Desert Rock Power Plant evaluated cumulatively? > Environmental Justice > * Ask the EPA how Desert Rock complies with Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations." Compliance with Environmental Justice is required for the Air Quality permit, where issues of concern include, "Disproportionate exposure to pollutants, potential health problems (respiratory, heavy metals in fish)." > EIS/Draft Air Quality Permit > * How can the Draft Air Quality Permit be evaluated when the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the entire project has yet to be released? Why does the comment period for the air quality permit close (October 27, 2006) before the Draft EIS is released to the public later this year? > * How does the public know that the entire proposed Desert Rock project and associated infrastructure is incorporated and evaluated in the proposed Air Quality Permit? > * Where will the power generated by Desert Rock be transmitted to and what will be the associated air quality impacts? > Modeling > * Has the proper modeling been applied to the analysis of Desert Rock? > * What is the background monitoring data for the Desert Rock project, such as for ammonia, and how is it applied to the PSD permit in the analysis of Best Available Control Technology? vote for peace and action vote for the moral issue of saving our planet to reach to Why keep checking for Mail? The all-new Yahoo! Mail shows you when there are new messages.</p>
835	Marianne Edain	<p>SUBJECT: comments on Desert Rock power plant TEXT/COMMENTS: To Whom It May Concern, Please include these comments in your decision-making process. The proposal for a new coal-fired power plant on Navajo Nation land south of Farmington, New Mexico is a bad idea at a bad time. Please reject this proposal out of hand. The state of New Mexico is fabulously rich in solar access. The development of solar energy would not require the destruction of native cultural sites or spewing of toxic exhausts into the atmosphere. It would also not require the theft of scarce water or increasing the contribution of fossil fuel exhaust to global warming. If tax breaks are going to be given, redirecting the taxes of the entire populace to benefit a particular enterprise, those breaks should be targeted toward the most socially and ecologically beneficial technology, not the least. Please reject any and all permit applications for Desert Rock Power Plant and any other coal-fired power plant proposals. Thank you, Marianne Edain Frosty Hollow Ecological</p>

Num ber		Notes
		Restoration [REDACTED]
836	Marianne Mate	SUBJECT: comments on Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: To whom it may concern; I am strongly opposed to the construction and operation of the proposed new Desert Rock Power Plant 25 miles Southwest of Shiprock. Those of us in SW Colorado who have no governmental influence over this particular project are already beginning to suffer from the pollution produced by other nearby plants that come to our area via consistent patterns of airflow in this region as documented by many sites in Mesa Verde and the National Forests in Colorado as well as Wilderness areas in Colorado and Utah. What justifies this new plant? Why not empower the Navajo to create wind power plants, or other alternative energy types that would make them true leaders both financially and environmentally. Yours Truly, Marianne Mate [REDACTED] Dolores, Co 81323
837	Mark Dawson	SUBJECT: Comments on Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: To Whom It Concerns: Upon receiving information that yet another coal plant is being considered in the Four Corners area I decided to provide my input. While I currently live in the mid-west, I have spent many years living in and exploring the southwest. My first trip was to the Grand Canyon in 1971 as a Boy Scout, and I immediately became enchanted with the area. Over the years I have watched the air quality throughout the region decline as more power plants have been brought on line and populations jump. It is now a rare day when the brown haze from power plants is not browning the horizon, full of particulates and other hazardous emissions. I am a strong believer that the consumers of electricity should have power plants in their neighborhoods. That is the only way for people to be faced with their own over-consumption of energy. Cause and effect would be come very apparent, resulting in the requirement that consumers become more efficient in their energy use and make full use of available technologies to scrub coal plant exhaust gases. The Four Corners area produces massive amounts of power, way more than it consumes. Please use wisdom and foresight. Plan for future generations, and not current political/corporate demands. DO NOT APPROVE THE DESERT ROCK POWER PLANT. Sincerely. Mark Dawson [REDACTED] Amherst, WI 54406
838	Martha Evers	SUBJECT: TEXT/COMMENTS: Common sense here folks !!! DO THE RIGHT THING, do not approve this permit.
839	Mary Ann Berry	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: To Whom It May Concern: As a Four Corners resident and homeowner, I am highly concerned about our beautiful scenery and surrounding environment in regards to the Desert Rock Power Plant. Whenever I visit Mesa Verde National Park and see the brown haze in the distance (more every year), I am reminded of what we humans have done/are doing to this planet. Please stop and consider the role our government is having on the well-being and health of our air, lands, and future. PLEASE: • Weigh strongly where Desert Rock wants to be located; it's not far from the Four Corners power plant -- one of the dirtiest in the country. • Measure the air quality at Mesa Verde and factor it into the overall air quality assessment. (Locals have reported more days each year when they have greater difficulty breathing.) • Monitor mercury contamination in area reservoirs; higher levels have appeared AFTER other coal-fired power plants began operating. • Consider ALL of the available technology for coal-fired plants in regards to pollution control. • Provide for independent monitoring, paid by the plant, to insure that environmental issues are truly checked -- and promises kept. • Don't use "side" agreements that are not legally enforceable; make

Number		Notes
		legally binding stipulations of any permits issued. • Don't issue a Clean Air Act Prevention of Significant Deterioration permit before the Environmental Impact Analysis is released. If you do, it gives the impression (the reality?) of issuing the permit no matter what the EIS finds. • And finally, don't approve the Clean Air Act Prevention of Significant Deterioration permit for the Sithe Global Energy company until you have uncovered all the facts, put strict safeguards in place, and guaranteed future monitoring. You still have time to make a critical difference, do it. Thank you, Mary Ann Berry Mary Ann Berry [REDACTED] Durango, Colorado 81302 [REDACTED]
840	Mary Margaret Carson	SUBJECT: coal-fired power plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Approval of this power plant is not justified by any stretch of the imagination. We have seen the effects of burning coal in Tijeras; we have dying pinon trees, teachers and children in the schools in Tijeras with acute respiratory symptoms, and people pretending that burning coal in a cement plant is somehow not the same coal burned in a power plant. The effects of a coal power plant on people and environment are devastating. Don't approve this! We need wind farms and solar. We do not need to destroy the environment and the Navajo Nation for someone else's profit.
841	Mary O'Brien	SUBJECT: Air Quality Comments. TEXT/COMMENTS: This e-mail is regarding the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant 25 miles southwest of Shiprock. I do not believe the company will spend the necessary money for coal scrubbers that will emit NO emissions. In today's society, ANY emission is unacceptable. We live in an area that is excellent for SOLAR AND WIND power, not another coal fired plant that is obsolete before it is even built. Please reconsider creating this plant and go for alternative sources of energy for our future health and well being. Thank You, Mary O'Brien, Four Corners Resident Do you Yahoo!? Get on board. You're invited to try the new Yahoo! Mail.
842	MARY OSWALD	SUBJECT: desert rock power plant input TEXT/COMMENTS: I am sending this to you again as I did not include a SUBJECT and wanted to make sure you received it --- the forwarded message follows --- ----- Message from "MARY OSWALD" on Fri, 27 Oct 2006 18:17:53 -0600 ----- To: desertrockairpermit@epa.gov Dear EPA, Have you ever been to the 4 Corners area of the United States? It is perhaps one of the most remote and beautiful places I have ever seen and I consider myself lucky to live here. Unfortunately, this beauty belies incredible air pollution problems all around us that are worse than many large cities thanks to the Four Corners Power Plant and the San Juan Generating Station. You already know the statistics regarding contaminants from this power plant. But do you know my 49 year old husband was diagnosed with cancer this year? Do you know my across the street neighbor had a lumpectomy yesterday? Do you know my neighbor around the corner died from breast cancer 4 years ago at age 41? She was a single mother, by the way. Another friend up the hill from us, approx. 5 blocks away is battling breast cancer. And our dear friends' 11 year old daughter is up in Denver at Children's Hospital battling leukemia. Yet you sit in Washington DC deciding our fates and the fate of our dear planet by approving this monolith, the Desert Rock Power Plant. How dare you and the entire Bush administration, under the guise of PROTECTION...please take a minute to think of your mission again...PROTECTION...work to undermine environmental laws. And for what? Short term gain, selfish shortsightedness and GREED. You should be so ashamed. I can only hope that there is a day in the future when you look back on your life and what you could have and should have done while in a position that could have left such a positive legacy, but chose

Num ber		Notes
		to do the opposite. I hope that when that day comes, you cannot sleep at night. Very Sincerely, Mary Oswald [REDACTED] Durango, CO 81301
843	MARY OSWALD	SUBJECT: TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear EPA, Have you ever been to the 4 Corners area of the United States? It is perhaps one of the most remote and beautiful places I have ever seen and I consider myself lucky to live here. Unfortunately, this beauty belies incredible air pollution problems all around us that are worse than many large cities thanks to the Four Corners Power Plant and the San Juan Generating Station. You already know the statistics regarding contaminants from this power plant. But do you know my 49 year old husband was diagnosed with cancer this year? Do you know my across the street neighbor had a lumpectomy yesterday? Do you know my neighbor around the corner died from breast cancer 4 years ago at age 41? She was a single mother, by the way. Another friend up the hill from us, aprox. 5 blocks away is battling breast cancer. And our dear friends' 11 year old daughter is up in Denver at Children's Hospital battling leukemia. Yet you sit in Washington DC deciding our fates and the fate of our dear planet by approving this monolith, the Desert Rock Power Plant. How dare you and the entire Bush administration, under the guise of PROTECTION...please take a minute to think of your mission again...PROTECTION...work to undermine environmental laws. And for what? Short term gain, selfish shortsightedness and GREED. You should be so ashamed. I can only hope that there is a day in the future when you look back on your life and what you could have and should have done while in a position that could have left such a positive legacy, but chose to do the opposite. I hope that when that day comes, you cannot sleep at night. Very Sincerely, Mary Oswald [REDACTED] Durango, CO 81301
844	Matt Robinson	SUBJECT: public comment TEXT/COMMENTS: I am writing to comment on the proposed Desert Rock coal-burning power plant. I do not think it should be built because the EPA has not done enough to protect the environment from mercury and particulates. As a nation, we need to do more to use renewable and cleaner forms of energy. Thank you. Matthew J. Robinson [REDACTED]. Dolores, CO 81323 [REDACTED] Find a local pizza place, music store, museum and more...then map the best route!
845	Matthew Kraushaar	SUBJECT: Desert Rock TEXT/COMMENTS: Robert Baker, Air-3 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 75 Hawthorne St., San Francisco, CA 94105 Regarding the Proposed Desert Rock Power Plant As a live long resident of Colorado and a 20 year resident of Durango, I would like you to consider my input regarding the proposed Desert Rock Facility, I have the following comments; 1) The current air pollution situation in Shiprock (the brown haze is visible from Durango) is terrible and until the current plants clean-up I can not believe you would permit a third. 2) Have you heard on Global warming? I know the Bush administration does not "believe" in global warming, but this is not religion guys, this is science, do your job here and act as a scientist and consider the impact of the millions of pounds of carbon dioxide that will be released by this new plant. You know once this plant is built you can undo it. 3) Your permit should consider mercury emissions. 4) These New York investors could care less what happens to the 4 corners area - but I hope you will search your soul and do the right thing and protect my environment and that of my children and family. 5) If you personally feel too much pressure to approve this permit, I would like to suggest that you resign your position. Sincerely Mathew Kraushaar
846	MATTHEW T	SUBJECT: pollution TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear sirs, I own property in durango and in L.A. I dare you to drive the road from farmington to navajo nation. It is

Number		Notes
	HANSON	worse than L.A. It is appalling the beautiful blue sky abruptly turns yellow and clean mountain air is transformed into an acrid stench. We all know that the BUSH, Cheney, Haliburton administration is all about the money-kickbacks to hell with the environment and our country's dwindling natural resources. I live on lake vallacito one of the most beautiful mountain lakes in the world and we can't eat the fish because of mercury which falls as rain into the lake which comes from those coal fired plants. God instructed us to be stewards of the land to take good care of it. Please do not allow them to build yet another gross polluter if anything we need to shut those two down that are already in existence. Think of our kids and grandkids would they rather have some money just to spend it or would they rather have beautiful mountains, lakes, and streams - surely those gross polluters are ruining one of the most pristine environments on the planet earth. sincerely yours, Matthew Hanson Teacher
847	matthewkeefauver	SUBJECT: Permit TEXT/COMMENTS: To whom it may concern: As a city councilman of the City of Cortez, I would respectfully ask for a delay in the permitting process for the Desert Rock plant until proper public comment and the time required to do so is allowed. Sincerely, Matthew Keefauver Check Out the new free AIM(R) Mail -- 2 GB of storage and industry-leading spam and email virus protection.
848	MB McAfee	SUBJECT: Proposed Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Hello, I want to urge that all the figures about this proposed power plant be examined carefully including power produced, cost to customers, and added pollutants to the air here in the Four Corners. I am against this project and want to register my opposition. Frankly, I view this as basically a futile effort because I see no way that citizens like myself can have influence on a decision that has been made for several years. But I am a persistent individual so I will lend my voice to those of others in opposition to this project. Thank you. MB M. B. McAfee, Ph.D. [REDACTED] Lewis CO 81327 [REDACTED]
849	melanie	SUBJECT: NO to 'cancer alley' TEXT/COMMENTS: The US EPA's draft decision is NOT consistent with the Clean Air Act and I do NOT believe the assessment of how the project would affect air quality was performed correctly. Allowing Desert Rock Energy Facility to be built in New Mexico may bring some jobs and money into our area, true. But I believe the health of the Navajo people and others will suffer greatly, as polluters move into our rural area. The area already houses two coal-fired plants, which rate among the country's 50 dirtiest in terms of carbon-dioxide and mercury emissions. The Four Corners Plant ranks first in nitrogen-oxide emissions, according to the Center for Environmental Integrity in Washington, D.C. Locally, a monitoring station at Mesa Verde National Park recorded the country's third-highest level of mercury in the atmosphere. The proposed power plant will also harm our water, air and food. Coal-fired power plants are the largest source of mercury contamination in this country. Local plants emitted 46 tons of mercury in 1990, and this amount is expected to climb 33 percent by 2010. Pollution from coal-fired plants damage forests and crops; it increases warming and contributes to weather disasters. The soils of our grazing areas are blackening from coal dust for a radius of 30 miles from the power plants. The hot dry weather kills our crops during the hot summer months. The water holes and ponds dry out from the heat. The EPA ties respiratory problems like coughing, throat irritation and congestion to ozone and says it can worsen conditions like emphysema, bronchitis and asthma. Inhaled often enough, ozone can cause permanent damage to lung tissue. Nitrogen oxide (NOx) and volatile organic compounds

Number		Notes
		(VOC) create ozone and coal-fired power plants and other sources emit NOx and VOC. WE CANNOT AFFORD TO LIVE LIKE THIS! PLEASE DENY THE PERMIT! Stop the Forest Service from killing more wolves, bears, cougars, and other animals in the wild: http://go.care2.com/99055 http://www.Care2.com Free e-mail. 100MB storage. Helps nonprofits.
850	Melissa Epple	<p>SUBJECT: Stop Desert Rock Power Plant! TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Sirs, The following are sane reasons to NOT allow any further discussion or action on the Desert Rocks permit. Desert Rock Power Plant is a 1,500 megawatt coal-fired power plant proposed by Sithe Global Power, LLC on a 580-acre site approximately 25 miles southwest of Farmington, New Mexico on the Navajo Nation. Though touted as an economic development opportunity, this plant will, in fact, have seriously detrimental environmental and economic consequences for the Four Corners region. Here are just a few reasons to say NO to the Desert Rock Power Plant: Worsening the Climate Crisis—Two existing plants in the vicinity have been called two of the worst sources of pollution in the U.S. by the Environmental Protection Agency, spewing concentrations of a number of pollutants proven to be damaging to human health and the climate. The health of neighboring residents on Navajo lands has been compromised by their exposure to these toxins. Copious Water Use—Desert Rock Power Plant would use 4,500-acre-feet of water while local residents are unequipped with modern conveniences such as sinks, toilets, and bathtubs. Residents object to Sithe use of water that could be used for their own infrastructure. Human Health Threats—Residents object to being exposed to further pollution from what would be a third coal-fired power plant in the area. A health study needs to be conducted to address current health problems from the existing plants and lack of access to healthcare. Racist Exploitation of a Culturally Significant Site—Local residents object to the desecration of burials sites and the destruction of homes which have remained in their community since time immemorial. The area serves as spiritual meeting places and its religious significance is important. Outrageous Tax Breaks—Sithe Global Power would receive an 85% savings on their tax bill during construction as well as 75% savings during the first 10 years of operation and 61% over the following 15 years. But Sithe wants more; the New Mexico State Senate is considering passing a bill that would give the company 3 different options for calculating its tax burden, and Sithe Global would choose which formula to use to minimize its tax burden! Unnecessary Energy Production—Safer and cleaner energy options are available. Rather than depleting our natural resources, our cultural heritage, and the inheritance of our future generations by continuing to build coal-fired fire plants, we as a society must invest in alternatives These are real concerns! Sincerely, Melissa Epple</p>
851	Michael Cochran	<p>SUBJECT: Comments on Air Quality Permit for Desert Rock Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Thank you for the opportunity to offer comments on the Air Quality Permit for the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant. Based on the information made available to the public thus far, I have several serious concerns about the construction and operation of this plant. First, I believe that your evaluation of the Air Quality Permit is premature since the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the entire project has yet to be released to the public. Without the Draft EIS, how can we be sure that the cumulative impact of adding the proposed plant and its accompanying emissions load to the existing emission problems from the two power plants already operating in Northwest New Mexico has been adequately modeled and considered? An additional concern with regard to the siting is the location of this proposed plant relative to the intended market for its generated power. Why not locate the</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>plant closer to its markets, reportedly heavily developed portions of Arizona, rather than in an area that already has serious emission problems and is essentially bumping up against federal ozone limits now? This concentration of plants in the Four Corners Region has potential to degrade both public health and quality of life in several ways. And further degradation of the Class I airsheds in Mesa Verde National Park and the Weminuche Wilderness is certainly high on the list. I defy the EPA to stand on any high ground just north of Cortez, Colorado, and not see the visible pollution currently drifting northward up the Montezuma Valley on prevailing winds. Adding to the mercury emissions in the region is also a serious concern. Warnings about the mercury content in fish taken from McPhee Reservoir and other nearby lakes have already been issued by health authorities. Closely related to this are the requirements contained in Executive Order 12898 regarding environmental justice toward minority and low-income populations. The Navajo Reservation qualifies in both regards and would be dramatically affected by the addition of this proposed plant. In addition, the proposal as presented to the public does not include the required use of the Best Available Control Technology (BACT) for this plant. BACT for this plant would be gasification, not pulverized coal. Despite the proposed plant's claimed advantage of being located near sources of coal for fuel, this location poses more disadvantages than advantages. Just because the Four Corners Region is not a major US population center does not just justify adding yet another coal-fired power plant to the area. The proposal absolutely needs adequate modeling, sufficient background information, compliance with all existent regulations and executive orders, and the completion of the Draft EIS before issuance of a permit—if indeed such a permit can be granted at all after all relevant factors are fully considered. Thank you for considering these concerns. Michael Cochran [REDACTED] Dolores, CO 81323 e-mail Get the new Windows Live Messenger! Try it!</p>
852	michael danner	<p>SUBJECT: Sithe Global power 1500mw TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Mr. Robert Baker, I know that Arizona is growing and needs more power. I think you need to dig deep inside and not just rubber stamp another coal plant. There are approx. 150 to 180 new coal plants proposed in the USA at this time. Why is EPA is not regulating mercury? If I were an industrial manufacturer and sent about one ton of mercury into the air each year you would put me in jail would you not? What about global warming and CO2? You presently do not regulate it but there is a lawsuit which will be reviewed next month by the US Supreme court to do just that. The American people use electricity in huge amounts and do not seem to think much about it at all. It is people like yourself who's job it is to protect them even if they are not intelligent enough to realize that their wasting energy contributes to the worlds demise. To be very transparent I am working on wind power and battery storage to help alleviate the variability of wind power. If the EPA would force coal plants to sequester carbon dioxide and control mercury along with the other contaminants which it already regulates wind and solar would be economically viable. We can power this whole country with those resources. You have an obligation to yourself your children and mine to do just that. Thank you for your time and consideration. Michael Danner [REDACTED] Telluride Co. 81435 [REDACTED] Find a local pizza place, music store, museum and more...then map the best route! http://local.live.com</p>
853	michael danner	<p>SUBJECT: EPA and Green tags TEXT/COMMENTS: I want to add the EPA has been a real leader in purchasing green tags "REC's" to offset their own electrical usage. How in their thinking can they want to allow this plant to happen. There are 180 new coal fired plants in planning stages right now. We</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>do not need them. Do not listen to the utilities and their financiers!!! We can solve our energy problems at least the ones in the US West by solar, Wind, Battery storage and bio-fuels. The gov. pays farmers not to grow. Colorado is a huge producer of Canola which can be made into Bio-diesel. We can firm up wind power with bio-diesel powered turbines. We can also use VRB batteries to firm up. South Eastern Colorado has enough wind to power the entire state. New Mexico has enough and Arizona does not however it has great Solar. If you need help understanding this I am here for you. "Tragedy of the Commons" Michael Danner [REDACTED] Telluride Co. 81435 [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] Express yourself - download free Windows Live Messenger themes!</p> <p>http://clk.atdmt.com/MSN/go/msnnkwme0020000001msn/direct/01/?href=http://imagine-msn.com/themes/vibe/default.aspx?locale=en-us&source=hmtagline</p>
854	michael danner	<p>SUBJECT: desert rock TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Mr. Robert Baker, I want you to look at this website. solargenix.com They manufacture commercial scale solar products. although I am a wind farm developer, I think solar technology would be better in the Shiprock area. I am looking at combining solar, battery and wind. If you are interested please also see VRBpower.com to see the battery technology. This might help you see there are ways other than polluting the earth. I hope this will help you not allow permits for any more coal plants with out carbon sequestration and other pollution controls. Best Regards Michael Danner [REDACTED] Telluride Co. 81435 [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] Find a local pizza place, music store, museum and more...then map the best route! http://local.live.com</p>
855	Michele Martz	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: This letter is in response to the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant on Navajo Lands. I do not agree with this proposal. I do not believe it to be sustainable. I do not believe it is in good faith to build power plants on Tribal Lands to supply cities far away with power. We need a better solution than coal powered electricity. We need to think far into the future for many generations. Why not a solar energy plant like those in Nevada? Michele Martz Do You Yahoo!? Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around http://mail.yahoo.com</p>
856	Michelle/S hellie Reott	<p>SUBJECT: Comments on Desert Rock PSD Permit TEXT/COMMENTS: October 27, 2006 Robert Baker, Air-3 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 75 Hawthorne St. San Francisco, CA 94105 Mr. Baker - Please accept my comments as a resident of the Four Corners Region. I disagree with this permit process being ahead of the completion of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the entire project. I disagree with statements that this plant will be the most efficient technology available. That statement must be clarified by saying "for this type of coal combustion." I want to know why IGCC (Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle) - the cleanest and most efficient coal technology available today, which could be combined with carbon sequestration, was not a required alternative comparison for this project. Shouldn't it have been addressed under the Best Available Control Technology determination? Although not regulated under the current Clean Air Act, I want to see Mercury and Carbon Dioxide emissions addressed under this permit. Southwest Colorado and northern New Mexico's rivers and lakes already have warnings regarding consumption of fish due to mercury contamination. Mesa Verde has had some of the highest mercury readings in the United States. According to the EPA's website "emissions from coal-fired power plants -- the largest remaining sources of mercury emissions in the country." Despite the adoption of the Clean Air Mercury Rule, levels of mercury pollution are not addressed in</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>the PSD permit - despite statements on the EPA website that "New coal-fired power plants ("new" means construction starting on or after Jan. 30, 2004) will have to meet stringent new source performance standards in addition to being subject to the caps." I cannot comprehend how a permit for construction can be given that does not address mercury - despite assurances that mercury will be addressed under the Operating Permit. Along those lines, it seems that having one agency (US EPA) handling the construction permit and another agency (Navajo EPA) handing the operating permit sets up a situation where information will be lost, not conveyed, or otherwise not included in the overall analysis of this facility. Please explain how the US EPA and the Navajo EPA plan to address the handling of this potential information gap. Despite the U.S. Government's extremely delinquent denial of the near planetary consensus on the human caused contributions to global warming, 314 U.S. communities around the country have called for local and regional action to address global climate change via the Mayor's Climate Protection Agreement. Durango's City Council signed onto this earlier this month. Carbon dioxide emissions from the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant should be addressed. I want to be ensured that the modeling for the existing pollutants for the study area addressed all sources large and small on the Navajo Nation. Is there a gap in the analysis? What was done in the modeling to analyze cumulative air quality impacts? Given that ozone levels in the Farmington, New Mexico area may soon exceed ozone limits and that nitrogen oxides are a necessary component in the formation of ozone, how will Desert Rock affect ozone levels in the Four Corners region? The permit says that the VOC (ozone) emission will be more than 4 times the PSD significance level threshold. Why does the EPA not even mention ozone impacts in its Ambient Air Quality Impact Report? Why has the EPA failed to require one year of on-site preconstruction monitoring of ozone concentrations at the proposed Desert Rock site? Please explain why something as important as a mitigation strategy in Class I areas can remain in a side agreement between Sithe and Federal Land Managers rather than in the PSD permit to ensure enforceability. How could the EPA in good conscience "concluded it is appropriate to propose approval of the PSD permit while Sithe and the FLMs continue to discuss memorializing Sithe's commitment to perform the agreed upon mitigation strategy"? "Analysis of air quality and visibility impacts on Class I areas" is the third requirement of PSD review, is it not? We have eleven Class I areas that will be adversely impacted by this facility. How many other proposed power plants have that kind of impact on Class I areas and why aren't the concerns of the FLM's being addressed to ensure enforceability? It is unfortunate that Colorado, New Mexico, and the Navajo Nation are not addressed by the Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR). If so, the Navajo Nation would have "to be good neighbors, helping states downwind by controlling airborne emissions at their source" as indicated by then acting director Steve Johnson. I look forward to these concerns being addressed. Sincerely, Michelle Reott [REDACTED] Durango CO 81301 [REDACTED]</p>
857	Marsha J. Cohen	<p>SUBJECT: clean air TEXT/COMMENTS: Before I moved to Durango in 2001, I spent 4 years looking for a community where my asthma would be better and I could be more active. I visited Durango four times before I made my decision. I found I could hike and ride a bike without using an emergency inhaler. I did not realize that my investigation needed to go much deeper. For five years I have watched the air in Farmington get dirtier. I have learned of the asthma problems around the current Four Corner's plant. Now I am learning about the Desert Rock proposal and the four other plants that lurk in the future. I am</p>

Number		Notes
		terrified by what those plants will mean to people's health in the entire region. I strongly oppose the current Desert Rock proposal. Marsha J. Cohen [REDACTED] Durango, CO 81301
858	Nancy Brewer	SUBJECT: Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Robert Baker, 75 Hawthorne St., San Francisco, CA 94105 We are not in favor of another power plant in our area of Northwest New Mexico. We have enough sky pollution already. Count us for three CON votes against another power plant.
859	Nancy Wiley	<p>SUBJECT: NO PERMIT FOR DESERT ROCK COAL PLANT!</p> <p>TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Mr. Baker and the Environmental Protection Agency, I just sent an email expressing my concerns and opposition for the EPA permitting and allowing construction of the Desert Rock Power Plant on the Navajo Nation, San Juan County, New Mexico. Following, are some additional points. The "Environmental Protection Agency". What exactly is the Environmental Protection Agency and what is their purpose and goals? I looked onto the Web for a definition of the Environmental Protection Agency and this is what I found: The Environmental Protection Agency is a part of the federal government that enforces environmental laws. . . .for protection of the environment by the systematic abatement and control of pollution. . . .responsible for enforcing federal environmental regulations such as the Clean Air Act. . . .responsible for efforts to control air and water pollution. . . .The EPA is the governmental agency responsible for administration of laws to control and /or reduce pollution of air and water. If this is in fact the responsibility of the EPA, then how can they, with clear honest conscience, allow the construction of yet another Coal Fired Power Plant in this area with already compromised air quality. Please Protect the people of the Southwest! Do not permit and do not allow construction of Desert Rock Power Plant. Thank you for your time. Nancy Wiley Below is the letter that I previously sent. >October 27, 2006 >Hello Robert Baker and EPA, >I'm writing to voice my complete opposition to the proposed desert rock >coal plant. >This plant will contribute to global warming and pollute the surrounding >air quality with mercury, sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen oxides. Following >are questions I have: > Given that the San Juan Generating Station and Four Corners Power >Plant are well documented as two of the major polluting power plants in the >U.S., why does the EPA consider the adjacent siting of Desert Rock >appropriate? What about SOx, CO and NOx emissions? > Please explain, specifically, the methodology used for the air quality >modeling. Why were monitors in Farmington, New Mexico and Rio Rancho, New >Mexico used for background concentrations of pollutants in the modeling for >Desert Rock, rather than local monitors near the project site south of >Shiprock? What was done in the modeling to analyze cumulative air quality >impacts? > Given the documented health advisories in the region for Mercury, how >does the EPA plan on complying with the Clean Air Mercury Rule (2005) to >permanently limit and reduce mercury emissions from coal-fired power >plants? How are mercury advisories affecting Navajo Lake, McPhee >Reservoir, the San Juan River, and Vallecito Lake. > Given that ozone levels in the Farmington, New Mexico area may soon >exceed ozone limits and that nitrogen oxides are a necessary component in >the formation of ozone, how will Desert Rock affect ozone levels in the >Four Corners region? > Given the growing consensus about global warming caused by carbon >dioxide (CO2) emissions, and the likelihood that CO2 will be regulated in >the near future, how can EPA ignore the vast contribution to global warming >caused by Desert Rock? > Why is the EPA allowing the high concentration of power plants in the >Four Corners region degrading public health and quality of life? > What will occur to visibility in Class I areas like</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>Mesa Verde >National Park and Weminuche Wilderness? > Does the Draft Air Permit take into account non-stationary air quality >effects (including projected fugitive dust) associated with the proposed >Desert Rock Power Plant? How are the non-stationary and stationary air >quality impacts of the Desert Rock Power Plant evaluated cumulatively? >Environmental Justice > How does Desert Rock comply with Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions >to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income >Populations?" Compliance with Environmental Justice is required for the >Air Quality permit, where issues of concern include, "Disproportionate >exposure to pollutants, potential health problems (respiratory, heavy >metals in fish)." >EIS/Draft Air Quality Permit > How can the Draft Air Quality Permit be evaluated when the Draft >Environmental Impact Statement for the entire project has yet to be >released? Why does the comment period for the air quality permit close >(October 27, 2006) before the Draft EIS is released to the public later >this year? > How does the public know that the entire proposed Desert Rock project >and associated infrastructure is incorporated and evaluated in the proposed >Air Quality Permit? > Where will the power generated by Desert Rock be transmitted to and >what will be the associated air quality impacts? >Modeling > Has the proper modeling been applied to the analysis of Desert Rock? > What is the background monitoring data for the Desert Rock project, >such as for ammonia, and how is it applied to the PSD permit in the >analysis of Best Available Control Technology? >Air quality will worsen and mammalian life will suffer from the poisons >spewed by this plant. EPA must NOT permit a plant which will further injure >the earth and all who breathe! NO COAL PLANT! >thank you for your attention, Nancy Wiley [REDACTED] Durango, CO 81302 wileynancy@hotmail.com Find a local pizza place, music store, museum and more...then map the best route! http://local.live.com?FORM=MGA001</p>
860	Nancy Wiley	<p>SUBJECT: NO PERMIT FOR DESERT ROCK COAL PLANT! TEXT/COMMENTS: October 27, 2006 Hello Robert Baker and EPA, I'm writing to voice my complete opposition to the proposed desert rock coal plant. This plant will contribute to global warming and pollute the surrounding air quality with mercury, sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen oxides. Following are questions I have: Given that the San Juan Generating Station and Four Corners Power Plant are well documented as two of the major polluting power plants in the U.S., why does the EPA consider the adjacent siting of Desert Rock appropriate? What about SOx, CO and NOx emissions? Please explain, specifically, the methodology used for the air quality modeling. Why were monitors in Farmington, New Mexico and Rio Rancho, New Mexico used for background concentrations of pollutants in the modeling for Desert Rock, rather than local monitors near the project site south of Shiprock? What was done in the modeling to analyze cumulative air quality impacts? Given the documented health advisories in the region for Mercury, how does the EPA plan on complying with the Clean Air Mercury Rule (2005) to permanently limit and reduce mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants? How are mercury advisories affecting Navajo Lake, McPhee Reservoir, the San Juan River, and Vallecito Lake. Given that ozone levels in the Farmington, New Mexico area may soon exceed ozone limits and that nitrogen oxides are a necessary component in the formation of ozone, how will Desert Rock affect ozone levels in the Four Corners region? Given the growing consensus about global warming caused by carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions, and the likelihood that CO2 will be regulated in the near future, how can EPA ignore the vast contribution to global warming caused by Desert Rock? Why is the EPA</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>allowing the high concentration of power plants in the Four Corners region degrading public health and quality of life? What will occur to visibility in Class I areas like Mesa Verde National Park and Weminuche Wilderness? Does the Draft Air Permit take into account non-stationary air quality effects (including projected fugitive dust) associated with the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant? How are the non-stationary and stationary air quality impacts of the Desert Rock Power Plant evaluated cumulatively? Environmental Justice How does Desert Rock comply with Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations?" Compliance with Environmental Justice is required for the Air Quality permit, where issues of concern include, "Disproportionate exposure to pollutants, potential health problems (respiratory, heavy metals in fish)." EIS/Draft Air Quality Permit How can the Draft Air Quality Permit be evaluated when the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the entire project has yet to be released? Why does the comment period for the air quality permit close (October 27, 2006) before the Draft EIS is released to the public later this year? How does the public know that the entire proposed Desert Rock project and associated infrastructure is incorporated and evaluated in the proposed Air Quality Permit? Where will the power generated by Desert Rock be transmitted to and what will be the associated air quality impacts? Modeling Has the proper modeling been applied to the analysis of Desert Rock? What is the background monitoring data for the Desert Rock project, such as for ammonia, and how is it applied to the PSD permit in the analysis of Best Available Control Technology? Air quality will worsen and mammalian life will suffer from the poisons spewed by this plant. EPA must NOT permit a plant which will further injure the earth and all who breathe! NO COAL PLANT! thank you for your attention, Nancy Wiley [REDACTED] Durango, CO 81302 wileynancy@hotmail.com Try the next generation of search with Windows Live Search today! http://imagine-windowslive.com/minisites/searchlaunch/?locale=en-us&source=hmtagline</p>
861	Nathan Thompson	<p>SUBJECT: permit should be progressive TEXT/COMMENTS: I'm writing in opposition to the proposed Desert Rock power plant. The Four Corners are too hazy and polluted because of the current levels of permitted pollution from area power plants. Any additional air emissions should not be tolerated. However, if the permit should go through, then at least set some realistic standards for CO2 and heavy metal emissions. Please make the power plant be considerate of up to date coal mining reclamation, etc. Thanks for your consideration, Nate Thompson [REDACTED] Cortez, CO 81321</p>
862	Luana Heikes	<p>SUBJECT: another power plant?? TEXT/COMMENTS: Hello, I was raised in Cortez in the '50s and '60s when we had a splendid view of Shiprock, which often looked like the ship it was named after sailing in a blue sea. A clear, clean view from 50 miles away. When the present power plants were built, that view disappeared, as if the ship had been sunk in all the smoke. Now, I hear there may be a third power plant. I hope that this is not true. That area is already impacted enough by the power plants' smoke and other pollution. Those living on the Navajo reservation and in the towns of Shiprock and Farmington don't need further worries about their health or the health of their children and grandchildren. And I would hate to think what a third plant would do to the air quality as far away as Gallup, NM and Cortez, CO. Thank you for reconsidering the placement of another power plant in this beautiful part of the U.S. Sincerely, Luana Heikes [REDACTED] Fort Collins, CO 80521----- ----- NISC Colorado email: NISC@niscnet.com Office of NISC USA Content Development & Databases Life Sciences Division 1302</p>

Number		Notes
		S. Shields Street #A2-4 Fort Collins, Colorado, 80521 USA Tel: +1 970-4828576 Fax: +1 970-4828617 www.nisc.com
863	Nora Flucke	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Air Permit TEXT/COMMENTS: Nora Flucke 1798 County Road [REDACTED], CO 81326 [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] Dear Mr. Baker, I would like to make my comment heard before the permitting discussion for the proposed Desert Rock coal-fired power plant in the Four Corners area gets under way. As a local resident and health care worker I am concerned about deteriorating air and water quality that would be a consequence of incinerating more coal in our region. To make my argument against more mercury emissions into surrounding air and streams, let me quote directly from your website www.epa.gov/mercury/about.html: Coal-burning power plants are the largest human-caused source of mercury emissions to the air in the United States, accounting for over 40 percent of all domestic human-caused mercury emissions. The EPA has estimated that about one quarter of U.S. emissions from coal-burning power plants are deposited within the contiguous U.S. and the remainder enters the global cycle. Mercury exposure at high levels can harm the brain, heart, kidneys, lungs, and immune system of people of all ages. Birds and mammals that eat fish are more exposed to mercury than other animals in water ecosystems. Similarly, predators that eat fish-eating animals may be highly exposed. At high levels of exposure, methylmercury's harmful effects on these animals include death, reduced reproduction, slower growth and development, and abnormal behavior. Mercury easily vaporizes at room temperature and is well absorbed (80%) through inhalation. It readily crosses the maternal-fetal circulatory barrier (placenta) and can reach disproportionately high concentrations in unborn children. As a practicing Labor & Delivery nurse I feel that it is my responsibility to advocate for neonates of the Four Corners Area against increasing mercury exposure. A survey conducted by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention published in early 2003 found that one in 12 (eight percent) American women of childbearing age had mercury in their blood above the levels considered safe by the EPA. Mercury is toxic at any concentration and has no function as a trace mineral or otherwise in the human body. I understand that mercury emissions from coal-fired power generation are currently unregulated, which does not make mercury less toxic. Given that the San Juan Generating Station and Four Corners Power Plant are well documented as two of the major polluting power plants in the U.S., how can additional emissions from Desert Rock be justified? Did the Four Corners region become a national sacrifice area because its air quality is already so poor? I recall that the cities of Farmington and Bloomfield in NM, just down-wind from the two existing power plants, were already closing in on upper-level limits for ozone just a few years ago. When taking the cumulative effects of nitrogen oxides (which are a necessary component in the formation of ozone) into consideration how can these down-wind cities be expected to stay within legal limits regarding EPA air-quality standards? Let me raise a few more questions that the EPA should take into consideration during the decision making process: How are mercury advisories affecting wildlife in Navajo Lake, McPhee Reservoir, the San Juan River, and Vallecito Lake? Given the growing consensus about global warming caused by carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions, and the likelihood that CO2 will be regulated in the near future, how can EPA ignore the vast contribution to global warming caused by Desert Rock? What will occur to visibility in Class I areas like Mesa Verde National Park and Weminuche Wilderness? Does the Draft Air Permit take into account non-stationary air quality effects (including projected fugitive dust) associated with</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant? How are the non-stationary and stationary air quality impacts of the Desert Rock Power Plant evaluated cumulatively? How will Desert Rock comply with Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations." Compliance with Environmental Justice is required for the Air Quality permit, where issues of concern include, "Disproportionate exposure to pollutants, potential health problems (respiratory, heavy metals in fish)." How can the Draft Air Quality Permit be evaluated when the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the entire project has yet to be released? Why does the comment period for the air quality permit close (October 27, 2006) before the Draft EIS is released to the public later this year? How does the public know that the entire proposed Desert Rock project and associated infrastructure is incorporated and evaluated in the proposed Air Quality Permit? Where will the power generated by Desert Rock be transmitted to and what will be the associated air quality impacts? Will this facilitate future growth/development of Western areas? What is the background monitoring data for the Desert Rock project, such as for ammonia, and how is it applied to the PSD permit in the analysis of Best Available Control Technology? Thank you for the opportunity to write you with my concerns about a third coal-fired power plant in our home area. When I moved onto my property I was able to view the stunning silhouette of Shiprock through the windows every day. Now a brown fog creeps through the San Juan Valley eastward like a banner and obscures everything to the South. I can only hope that we will once again be able to enjoy healthy air and clean water. Granting permission to build and operate the Desert Rock power plant is a step in the wrong direction in improving living condition in the Four Corners. Sincerely, Nora Flucke</p>
864	Susan Franzheim	<p>SUBJECT: EIS & Best Available Control Technology & side-agreements TEXT/COMMENTS: For Robert Baker: I am a non-partisan oil & gas consultant with the self-imposed mandate to: FUEL MORE VEHICLES on the INFORMATION HIGHWAY & am very concerned that all DUE DILIGENCE in re the Sithe project at Desert Rock has not been done. I must add that I have not independently verified the subject-line topics from the Cortez Montezuma League of Women Voters chairwoman, Mary Lou Asbury. Re the EIS: The concern is with the order of release by EPA; AFTER the Prevention of Significant Deterioration permit Re the BACT: Integrated-gassification-combined-cycle design not selected by EPA Re side-agreements: They must contain agreement aspects that are binding In this day & age we live in...trust but verify is not good enough; regulation & enforcement is essential. This is all a matter of what will affect our health & in some cases our very lives. Synergistically, Susan Franzheim 970.946.4644 (ALLTEL)...Mountain Zone 970.563.1000 - FAX Instructor @ Fort Lewis College/Extended Studies OIL & GAS 101: Basic Information for Stakeholders Regional Classes & Courses OIL & GAS BASICS OILandGASbasics@aol.com Founder & Facilitator Result Energized Synergy (RES) RES360RESULTS@aol.com Mid-month Columnist for Aztec, NM Talon Oil & Gas Basics 505.334.1039 aztecnews@sisna.com www.aztecnews.com Founder & Facilitator of COGS Coalition Of Gas-drilling Solutions</p>
865	Paul Lee.	<p>SUBJECT: Hg TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear sirs: I just received an email from Josh Joswick, County Commissioner of LaPlata County, Colorado. He stated that his comments concerning mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants were squelched here in Durango, CO last week at the public hearing of the Air Quality Control Commission relative to Desert Rock. I see more and more mercury contamination in my patients here in Durango, CO. We are down wind</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>from two coal-fired power plants already located in the same general area as the proposed Desert Rock facility. I am concerned that additional coal-fired power plants will only add to the already heavy burden this location is suffering as a result of aerosolized mercury. We cannot eat the fish in our lakes. I see memory dysfunction and other neurological disorders in my patients in all ages. The young ones are the most saddening. The frequency and severity of these disorders is increasing since I first started testing in 1995. Mercury as a contaminant from coal-fired power plants must be a consideration equal to the carbon, nitrate, and sulfate emissions. Mercury is the most toxic of all heavy metals and one of the most toxic elements, along with uranium, found on earth. If we are to continue to live on this planet of ours, we must stop polluting it. We must spend our resources on sustainable energy sources. Paul Lee R. Paul Lee, DO, FAAO, DABMA Osteopathic Center of the Four Corners, PC 150 Rock Point Drive, Unit C Durango, CO 81301 970-247-3717 tel 970-247-3806 fax osteopathic@frontier.net</p>
866	Patrick W boots	<p>SUBJECT: Permit comments TEXT/COMMENTS: Sirs: I write to encourage you to refuse to give a permit to the Desert Rock Power Plant 25. I live near Cortez, and have often seen, on my way to either Shiprock, or Farmington, or other desinations south of here, the cloud of pollution which ALREADY blankets the landscape down there. Nobody really needs more pollution - and for the Power company to deliberately choose Navajo land for the location of their polluting power plant - all power plants pollute, the difference is only a matter of degree - is another way to denigrate the native population of this country. I encourage you to refuse to give them a permit to pollute the air further. And make no mistake - a permit will be a permit to pollute! Pat Boots [REDACTED] Cortez, CO 81321 Kay and/or Pat Boots [REDACTED] God bless the whole world, no exceptions.</p>
867	Paul & Cheryl Folwell	<p>SUBJECT: permit TEXT/COMMENTS: The permit to desert rock should not be granted until the current coal fired plants are cleaned up. The air now in the four corners is polluted and a health hazard. Desert rock would only add to it. Why is the EPA avoiding the present problem with the existing power plants? Sincerely Paul Folwell</p>
868	Paul & Cheryl Folwell	<p>SUBJECT: emissions TEXT/COMMENTS: No to Desert Rock Permit with the present Plan. . The EPA is responsible to insure clean Air & Water. Thank You Paul Folwell</p>
869	Paul Cowden	<p>SUBJECT: clean air TEXT/COMMENTS: I would like to comment on the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant near Farmington NM. We already have 2 power plants in the area that produce much pollution and resultant health problems. They also cloud the views and our tourist based economy relies on majestic views. This plant will add to our problems and we don't want that. The concentration of power plants would be too great and an unfair burden on the population of the region. Please site this plant elsewhere. Sincerely, Paul Cowden [REDACTED] Durango CO 81301</p>
870	Paul Ermigiotti	<p>SUBJECT: TEXT/COMMENTS: I would like to voice my opinion on granting the permit for construction and operating the proposed Desert Rock coal fired power plant in New Mexico. I feel this is one of the most important environmental issues decisions facing the entire Four Corners region. I strongly urge you to deny this permit on the grounds of the negative impact it will surly bring to the area effecting both the quality of the air and water. In truth I would strongly recommend strengthening legislation on cleaner air and water standards for the whole nation. I hope you will seriously consider the long range effect this plant would have on our air quality. Thank you. Sincerely, Paul</p>

Number		Notes
		Ermigiott [REDACTED]. Cortez, CO 81321
871	Phyllis Hollenbeck	<p>SUBJECT: Say NO to Desert Rock TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Sirs and Madams: A friend of mine who lives even closer to the existing coal fired plants than my town of Cortez, CO, told me that "All of my nieces and nephews have asthma." We know that asthma cripples. We know that asthma kills." Is any child's life worth powering a television? Please save the children. Say no to Desert Rock. Clean up the existing plants, give us community verifiable monitoring, and fully support conservation and the natural move to sun and wind energy. This is life and death stuff. Please do the right thing. Phyllis Hollenbeck [REDACTED] Cortez, CO 81321 "The cost of a thing is the amount of what I call life which is required to be exchanged for it, immediately or in the long run." Henry David Thoreau Phyllis Hollenbeck [REDACTED]</p>
872	Pam Hurley	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Please know that I am completely against the Desert Rock Power Plant. The dirty film of air that already permeates the area around Ship Rock and throughout the the valley is ugly and unhealthy. I'm a native of Colorado and own land in Durango that I plan to build on. I love the southwest and the beauty that surrounds it. Please don't desecrate this land by building a power plant. Pam Hurley Durango, CO Check out the new AOL. Most comprehensive set of free safety and security tools, free access to millions of high-quality videos from across the web, free AOL Mail and more.</p>
873	Regan Bach	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Air Permit letter TEXT/COMMENTS: Sept. 14th, 2006 Attn: Robert Baker or, To Whom It May Concern, In response to the proposal for a Clean Air Act permit for the proposed Desert Rock power plant: 1) The Best Available Control Technology proposed for this project is an insufficient level of technology to provide safe power without damaging the health of the surrounding populations and environment. We are concerned that the levels of sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and particulates determined to be "of safe levels" through BACT, are extreme health dangers to those living within the nearby region, specifically those living on the Navajo Nation. Other populations will receive negative health effects from these air pollutants through visitation to this area, ground water contamination, air pollutants and general negative impacts on society and environment. The Best Available Control Technology is insufficient technology to protect the health of the citizens of the Navajo Nation, this country and the environment of the surrounding areas of the proposed site. 2) Insufficient research has been done concerning the full impact of pre-existing power plants in this area and other national areas. In relation to the environmental pollution, we are strongly opposed to the granting of any permit for new construction of power plants, before pre-existing and/or abandoned power plants have been completely decontaminated and cleaned up in a safe and contained manner. In specific, Four Corners Power Plant must be decontaminated, and destructed before any further permits are granted. 3) The NAAQS are inadequate standards to promote healthy living in this country. The impact of yet another power plant on the Navajo Nation will increase the risks of cancer and respiratory illnesses for the people who inhabit the Nation. We demand more research into the health risks environmental pollution caused by coal-fire power plants. We also demand more research into alternative, renewable power sources before the Desert Rock power plant is granted a Clean Air Act permit, or any permission to begin construction. Thank you for recognizing our comments and we urge your support to deny all permits to the Desert Rock power plant before all suggestions above are attended to, Regan</p>

Number		Notes
		and Ammie Bach [REDACTED] San Francisco, CA. 94109
874	Mary Wilson	<p>SUBJECT: not again! TEXT/COMMENTS: Attn: Robert Baker Dear Sir: there was speculation about possible air pollution when the first power plant was built in the Four Corners years ago, but it went through anyway. Within the expected time, air pollution was evident in the area. Standing at Mesa Verde National Park, at one time, Shiprock was a clear landmark. It has become less and less visible as a brown haze clouds the horizon. I'm sure there were complaints when the second plant was built, though I didn't live in the area at the time. There are so many reasons a permit should not be given for the construction of a third power plant in the Four Corners area.. Of course, power is needed. But there are cleaner ways to achieve it. The time to act is now, when you have leverage with a company eager for a go-ahead, not afterward when more brown haze and more mercury in our area reservoirs becomes triply evident. Prevent it from happening, don't try to remediate it once it's already there. Sincerely, Ms. Mary C. Wilson [REDACTED], Mancos, CO 81328 [REDACTED]</p>
875	Steve Cone	<p>SUBJECT: Fw: comment TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 10/20/2006 01:24 PM ----- Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US 10/20/2006 10:55 AM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Fw: comment ----- Forwarded by Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US on 10/20/2006 10:54 AM ----- Steve Cone 10/07/2006 06:11 AM To Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject comment TO: THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RE: ON PROPOSED RULEMAKING FOR SOURCE-SPECIFIC FEDERAL IMPLEMENTATION PLANS FOR FOUR CORNERS POWER PLANT AND NAVAJO GENERATING ` STATION FROM: Steve Cone [REDACTED] Farmington, NM 87401 [REDACTED] http://www.alpcentral.com INTRODUCTION The San Juan Basin and Four Corners Area comprise a region that can best be viewed as a National Sacrifice Area in which rules, regulations, and statutes -- including the National Environmental Policy Act and the Clean Air and Water Acts -- are routinely circumvented and purposely twisted by government and "cooperating" agencies to maximize the profits and extend the power of a favored few. Personnel from federal departments, bureaus, and agencies routinely function at the behest of industry lobbyists as the lapdogs of corporate profiteers. Now here tonight, we have EPA administrators officiously presiding over a culture of environmental degradation that has become the premier growth industry of this region. Unfortunately, this sort of corruption and graft is magnified in the San Juan Basin due to the unparalleled allowances and exemptions which private businesses and corporations are now afforded in joint agreements and lease arrangements with the federal and tribal governments on Indian trust lands. While corporate entities and their political conduits are empowered by such unrestrained access and influence, widespread public concerns about cumulative environmental and adverse socioeconomic impacts are routinely dismissed as irrelevant, insignificant, or "outside the scope" in federal assessments and studies of proposed projects. Currently, Sithe Global Power, LLC, and The Navajo Nation are proposing to construct a Desert Rock Energy Project on federal tribal trust land on the Navajo Reservation. Given the Project's large size and the various other existing and proposed energy development and generation facilities in and adjacent to the Basin, a comprehensive evaluation of the Project's cumulative impacts is of the utmost necessity. Only a fool would pretend that the potential, significant, adverse impacts of a Desert Rock Energy Project are isolated and unrelated to the substantial environmental degradation and severe health problems associated</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>with other facilities currently operating in and around the Four Corners area. And we are not here tonight to silently suffer such foolishness. Tonight's hearing is premature, presumptuous, and an affront to the sensibilities of responsible citizens. How so? The Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Department of the Interior have not even completed a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Project pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act. None of hundreds of questions and concerns voiced almost a year ago by scores of citizens and groups have been formally addressed. No valid purpose or need has been identified for this project. No reasonable range of alternatives has been seriously considered. The proponents of Desert Rock have made no reasonable case that the Project will not cause adverse effects to the human and natural environment. No meaningful mitigation strategy has been advanced to minimize Project impacts. The BIA has failed to offer timely response to community members, and now EPA has their cart before the horse. Yes, dog-and-pony-show is an apt metaphor for the official folderol we find before us here tonight. And, we, the people, are being victimized and poisoned by this process. The release of an adequate Draft EIS on Desert Rock is an obvious prerequisite to any informed comment on this EPA Clean Air Act Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) draft permit. But, we have no Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed Desert Rock Project. What we do know is that BIA's scoping process for their Draft EIS was deliberately designed to severely narrow the range of inquiry. By restricting the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement, so as to skirt the overriding issue of cumulative impacts, the Federal Government is effectively perverting NEPA, breaching the public trust, and making a mockery of their entire decision-making process. EPA has now moved front and center to play a key role in this travesty. It would be in everyone's best interest for EPA, Sithe, the BIA, URS, and the DinA Power Authority to slow down, back up, and at least pretend to make an honest, wholehearted effort to get it right. If the Project sponsors and their consultants are unwilling to be open with the public in assessing the cumulative impacts and human health consequences of the proposed action, if they are unwilling to give serious consideration to reasonable alternatives -- including the No Action Alternative, then they should pack up their bags and go peddle their power project elsewhere. But take note -- we do not care to have our communities further poisoned and looted by the politics of profiteers hell-bent on runaway, unsustainable growth. SPECIFIC CONCERNS: *** Since the get-go, Navajo residing in the proposed Project area have raised concerns that Sithe/DPA and certain Navajo Nation officials have not acknowledged an overwhelming opposition to the Project by Tribal members in the area and the rejection of the Project by local Chapter governments. Project promoters have sought to undermine all opposition by creating boundary disputes and pitting individual Tribal members and chapters against each other. Many have come to see this rightly for what it is --a classic land grab. Strong-arm tactics such as land withdrawals --finagled through the Tribal agencies-- are intended to satisfy promoters of Desert Rock and fill their international corporate coffers. The voices of tribal members who are rooted to the land are irrelevant to Sithe. We would all do well to listen closely to tribal members who are saying "no" to token payments for land that is their lifeblood; tribal members who are saying "no" to forced relocation; tribal members who are saying "no" to the uprooting and abandonment of their traditional ways; and "no" to the poisoning of their grandchildren by a third massive coal-fired power plant. *** In its "Ambient Air Quality Impact Report" (NSR 4-1-3, AZP 04-01), as mandated by 40 CFR 124.7 and 124.8, EPA sets forth what it claims to be "the</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>legal and factual basis for the permit conditions". EPA refers to the BIA's Draft Summary Scoping Report for the Desert Rock EIS, asserting that the public has raised only five issues of environmental justice with respect to the proposed Facility. In fact, the public's concerns about the environmental injustice of Desert Rock are much more widespread and deep-seated. But the EPA glibly states as follows: "In response to the concerns listed above, EPA is conducting additional outreach on the PSD aspects of the proposed Facility in the form of workshops with Dine translators, radio announcements in Dine, and translations of fact sheets in Dine. The applicant has also prepared a data presentation to better characterize the issues raised in the NEPA scoping effort regarding environmental justice and EPA expects that these issues will be addressed through the NEPA process." Did EPA's Dine translator happen to tell the people they should be honored to have their hearts ripped out so Californians can run their icemakers and Jacuzzis? The fact is that public concerns about Desert Rock remain largely ignored, and EPA's blasé characterization and gross misrepresentation of these environmental justice issues is offensive and unacceptable. *** Reports to tribal agencies indicate that the project promoters have engaged in verbal negotiations with elderly Navajo residents who are non-English speaking and uninformed about their legal rights and procedures. As a result, valuable grazing permits held for generations have been lost. Documents have been signed by elders without knowledge of their contents. This is immoral and illegal financial exploitation -- alien to the intent and spirit of federal and state environmental justice guidelines. Community members have objected to this type of mistreatment and expressed concern that they will continue to be subjected to such harassment and deceit by Sithe and other Project promoters. *** If the Project's promoters cannot clearly demonstrate that construction of Desert Rock will provide direct, long-term benefits to those elderly and impoverished Navajo in the proposed Project area without further jeopardizing the health and homes of their families, then this thinly veiled scheme should be seen for what it really is -- the deliberate use of cultural supremacy and economic subjugation to convert the wealth of Tribal resources held in trust into private corporate profits and increased power for an elite few at the expense of an ill-used and vulnerable minority. If only lip-service is paid to the principles of environmental justice, the oppressed will be forced to use any means at their disposal to protect their families and defend their communities. *** Who would contract for the power generated by the proposed Project? Where are the customers, and how would the environment be impacted by the infrastructure required to transmit and market the power? How much Desert Rock electricity would be available at a reasonable rate to be used by tribal members residing closest to Desert Rock? How much would be transmitted to markets off the reservation? *** Testimony by representatives of the BHP Corporation in connection with an air quality permit application indicated that emissions from another large coal fired power plant in the San Juan Basin would result in exceedance of significant impact levels to air quality in the proposed Desert Rock Project area. The transcript of that BHP testimony needs to be included and directly addressed within this -- EPA's Clean Air Act Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit process. *** The cumulative human health impacts attributable to the San Juan Basin's deteriorating regional air quality must be clearly identified. A comprehensive study of cancer rates and associated etiology needs to be conducted in an expanded Project Study Area. These results need to be published as part of the NEPA/EIS process and included in EPA's Clean Air Act Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permitting</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>process for Desert Rock. EPA should examine connections between elevated levels of mercury in power plant emissions and the incidence of childhood autism in the San Juan Basin. The incidence and relative severity of adult and childhood respiratory illnesses such as asthma must be carefully documented and seriously weighed by EPA. Can you say “choke”, “gasp”, “wheeze”, and “retch”? Polluted air causes a narrowing of the blood vessels, which can contribute to the risk of heart attack and stroke. Long-term exposure to air pollution also increases the threat of lung diseases such as cancer and asthma, a serious health threat for Navajo tribal members who rightly object to being exposed to further pollution from yet a third massive coal-fired plant. A study needs to be conducted to address health problems and lack of access to healthcare for tribal members in San Juan County. *** The federal government’s penchant for servicing corporate interests at the expense of public health is manifest in the flawed modeling scheme used to estimate air pollution impacts of the proposed Project. Air pollution modeling now in use simply serves as a springboard for unrestrained growth and the cutthroat-profit motives of energy extraction and power development interests in the San Juan Basin. Throughout the Project Study Area, current air pollution monitoring techniques are inadequate, intentionally haphazard, and deliberately deceptive. This would be laughable if it was not so tragic. Such bad-science modeling generates data driven by preordained results rendered in deference to the agenda of the Basin’s energy extraction and power production industries. Is there anyone here so naive as to actually believe that public input will be taken seriously in this EPA process, when it is common knowledge that industry executives are joined at the hip to top government agents and officials who routinely provide cartes blanches to corporate energy interests? Does EPA have to do business by distorting objective scientific knowledge for political ends and then misrepresenting or even withholding the facts from the public at large? *** Your agency is mandated to ensure air quality protection to mandatory Class 1 Federal impact areas. Sithe’s own modeling indicates Bandelier NM, Mesa Verde NP, Canyonlands NP, Petrified Forest NP, San Pedro Parks WA, and Weminuche WA could be subject to significant negative impacts should Desert Rock be permitted. Before the San Juan Basin’s air becomes even murkier, an accurate cumulative visibility analysis must be completed and made available to the public for review. When will this be done and how will the results of the study be disseminated? In its Ambient Air Quality Impact Report, EPA states: “For Class I areas, Sithe’s modeling showed that the emissions from the Facility could potentially have an impact on an Air Quality Related Value (AQRV). Specifically, Sithe’s modeling indicated that the Facility’s emissions would result in greater than 5% extinction of visibility on at least 1 day at 11 of the surrounding 15 Class I areas. The [three] Federal Land Managers requested Sithe to perform additional modeling. Sithe performed several rounds of additional modeling to evaluate if the Facility’s emissions would have an adverse impact on Class I area visibility. On April 25, 2006, the United States Forest Service (USFS) sent a letter to EPA referring to a “mitigation strategy” that Sithe had proposed to the FLMs. The USFS letter indicated that Sithe’s performance of the mitigation strategy would be sufficient to alleviate its concerns about visibility. The USFS letter requested EPA to include the mitigation strategy in Sithe’s PSD permit so that Sithe’s proposal would be federally enforceable. EPA had subsequent discussions with the FLMs to explain EPA’s preference for the mitigation strategy to remain in a side agreement between Sithe and the FLM rather than in Sithe’s PSD permit. We understand that Sithe and the FLMs are continuing to discuss appropriate</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>mechanisms other than the PSD permit to memorialize Sithe's commitment to perform the mitigation strategy. Accordingly, EPA has concluded it is appropriate to propose approval of the PSD permit while Sithe and the FLMs continue to discuss memorializing Sithe's commitment to perform the agreed upon mitigation strategy." EPA must make public the letter from the USFS under the Freedom of Information Act. Furthermore, the EPA should explain how the public interest will be best served by endorsing a so-called "side agreement" for the performance of a mandatory mitigation strategy by Sithe. Any significant damage by Sithe to Class 1 Federal areas (including wilderness areas, parks and monuments) must be treated in a mitigation strategy within EPA's Draft Clean Air Act Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit. EPA should stop trying to sidestep the issue of mitigation and add strong teeth in the Desert Rock Draft permit. *** Impacts of the Project to water quality and supply must be fully determined. Sithe has stated that the Project will deplete 4500 AFY of New Mexico's groundwater from the Morrison Aquifer at a rate of 100 percent with zero return flows to the San Juan River Basin. What are the associated potential impacts of the Project to water quality (TDML) and to the endangered fish species' habitat along the San Juan River? How will Sithe's water mining impact native flora and fauna? To what extent might cavitation impact cultural and archaeological resources in the Basin? To what degree would existing water wells be impacted and how might historic uses be impaired? EPA must examine unresolved San Juan Basin water rights and claims to water, settlements, and adjudication proceedings. *** In addition to Desert Rock, a long list of energy development proposals in the Basin includes over 12,000 new coal-bed methane and oil and gas wells, the Peabody Mustang Power Plant, and a Ute Mountain Ute power generation facility. If the Desert Rock Project were considered in conjunction with these other new and proposed major sources of air pollution, the picture would be one of further significant air quality degradation incompatible with specific provisions and goals of the Clean Air Act. In other words, we are talking not about the promise of Clear Skies, but about the prospect of additional tons of airborne filth and carcinogens, showered over the populace like manna by an amoral Administration run amok. The bottom line is that if serious, full consideration is not given to the cumulative impacts of federally sanctioned projects in San Juan Basin, any issuance by EPA of a Clean Air Act Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit for Desert Rock ought to be embossed with an official seal certifying the San Juan Basin as a permanent National Sacrifice Area. *** Disraeli was right in his observation that there are "lies, damn lies and statistics". There is concern that the Cumulative Increment Analysis presented by Sithe in connection with its May 2004 application is fundamentally and fatally flawed. Sithe's claim to credit allowances for what are in reality inapplicable emission reductions at San Juan and Four Corners power plants is unjustifiable and proscribed. Overall, discrepancies and deficiencies in Sithe's assumptions, methodology and data necessitate that the Cumulative Increment Analysis be rejected by EPA, redone, and completed so as to provide reliable and valid results. Peer review must be incorporated within this process.</p> <p>CONCLUSION The Farmington Daily Times reported in December 2004 that the anger of many citizens commenting at the BIA's Desert Rock scoping hearing was palpable. Much of this outrage is justifiable because it stems from a recognition in the minds of public citizens, Indian and non-Indian, both on and off the reservation, that they are being viewed simply as a nuisance, that their concerns are insignificant, and that their participation in the process --while a necessary evil-- is wholly irrelevant to the final, preordained outcome of the</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>NEPA process. Now EPA has demonstrated that the Department of the Interior has no corner on the market of corruption and hypocrisy. As Derrick Jensen stated at Fort Lewis College a few months ago, "When hope dies, action begins." So, I won't pretend to hope that my comment will be weighed with thoughtful consideration; I won't pretend to hope that EPA's decision regarding Desert Rock will be based on the consent of the governed and, not, as has so often been the case, an arrogant and willful contempt of the governed.</p>
876	David LeMoine	<p>SUBJECT: Fw: Four Corners Air Quality, Clean air warrants strict standards TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 10/25/2006 02:04 PM ----- Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US 10/25/2006 11:50 AM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Fw: Four Corners Air Quality, Clean air warrants strict standards ----- Forwarded by Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US on 10/25/2006 11:49 AM ----- David LeMoine 10/25/2006 11:42 AM To Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Four Corners Air Quality, Clean air warrants strict standards October 25, 2006 Rebecca Rosen, Air Division (AIR-2) EPA Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, CA 9410 Dear Rebecca Rosen, Do not issue a Clean Air Act permit for the proposed Desert Rock power plant This third power plant will add 10% to 15% more Nitrogen Oxides to the existing damaged air quality in the Four Corners, and 114 lbs. more Mercury. We are surrounded by toxic fallout (mercury, volatile organic compounds and nitrogen oxide, high concentrations of ozone destroying pollution and fugitive emissions of ash from coal mining) from two existing coal-fired power plants that rank highest among the dirtiest in the nation for dumping tons of pollution into the air we breathe and the water and land we use. If the proposed Desert Rock power plant cannot be fitted with true clean air technology that absorbs all emissions toxic and damaging to human, animal, and plant life, it will more seriously harm the quantity and quality of life in the Four Corners and all living systems down wind from its source. Please see that the two existing power plants are fitted with true anti-pollution and clean air technology that absorbs all toxic emissions, or supply a list of activities that do not require breathing or the use of water or land in the Four Corners. We live in Farmington, San Juan County, New Mexico, located in the heart of the Four Corners. Our family takes part in numerous outdoor activities, each of which requires breathing the air. We use the water too for drinking cooking, washing and other life sustaining activities. We also use the water for leisure and recreational pursuits such as swimming, fishing, boating, and camping. We enjoy walking on the land and take pleasure in viewing and photographing the natural, scenic beauty of the Four Corners area. In addition we repeatedly visit and take our visiting guests to all the cultural and geologic sites including all the National Parks and wilderness areas in New Mexico, Colorado, Utah and Arizona. Eating the fish out of the Animas and other New Mexico Rivers is presently hazardous because of mercury poisoning. Breathing the air is risky because of the present degraded air quality from present power plant emissions and present fugitive dust from coal mining. A brown-yellow haze hanging in the air already adversely impacts visibility. Before the EPA issues a Clean Air Act permit for the proposed Desert Rock power plant, it must address the following questions of serious concern to us. EIS/Draft Air Quality Permit How can the Draft Air Quality Permit be evaluated when the Draft EIS has yet to be released? How does the public know that the entire proposed Desert Rock project and associated infrastructure is incorporated and evaluated in the proposed Air Quality Permit? Where will the power generated by Desert Rock be transmitted to and what will be the associated air quality impacts? Emissions Given that the San Juan Generating Station and</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>Four Corners Power Plant are well documented as two of the major polluting power plants in the U.S., why does the EPA consider the site of Desert Rock appropriate? What about SOx, Co and NOx emissions? Sithe contends that they have done, "extensive air quality modeling completed per EPA, Navajo Nation EPA and National Park Service requirements " We ask the EPA to describe, specifically, the methodology used for the air quality modeling. Why were monitors in Farmington, New Mexico and Rio Rancho, New Mexico used for background concentrations of pollutants in the modeling for Desert Rock? What was done in the modeling to analyze cumulative air quality impacts? Given the documented health advisories in the region for Mercury, how does the EPA plan on complying with the Clean Air Mercury Rule (2005) to permanently limit and reduce mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants? How are mercury advisories affecting Navajo Lake, McPhee Reservoir, the San Juan River, and Vallecito Lake? Given that ozone levels in the Farmington, New Mexico area may soon exceed ozone limits and that NOx is a necessary component in the formation of ozone how will Desert Rock affect ozone levels in the Four Corners region? Given the growing consensus about global warming caused by carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions, and the likelihood that CO2 will be regulated in the near future, how can EPA ignore the vast contribution to global warming caused by Desert Rock? Why is the EPA allowing the high concentrations of power plants in the Four Corners region degrading public health and quality of life? What will occur to visibility in Class 1 areas such as Mesa Verde National Park and the Weminuche Wilderness? Does the Draft Air Permit take into account non-stationary air quality effects (including projected fugitive dust) associated with the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant? How are non-stationary and stationary air quality impacts of the Desert Rock Power Plant evaluated cumulatively? Environmental Justice How will Desert Rock comply with Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations?" Compliance with Environmental Justice is required for the Air Quality permit, where issues of concern include, "Disproportionate exposure to pollutants, potential health problems (respiratory, heavy metals in fish)" (USEPA Air Quality Impact Report, NSR 4-1-3, AZP 04-01) Seriously Concerned, David and Kandy LeMoine [REDACTED] Farmington, New Mexico 87401-9114 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p>
877	Joseph R. Sykes	<p>SUBJECT: Fw: Draft Air Quality Permit for Desert Rock Due Diligence TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 10/25/2006 10:45 AM ----- Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US 10/25/2006 10:16 AM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Fw: Draft Air Quality Permit for Desert Rock Due Diligence another comment: ----- Forwarded by Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US on 10/25/2006 10:16 AM ----- "JRS@GoodAfterMorning" 10/25/2006 10:13 AM Please respond to "JRS@GoodAfterMorning" To Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc info@iecsolar.com Subject Draft Air Quality Permit for Desert Rock Due Diligence Ms. Rosen, and the U.S. E.P.A., Region 8 and 9, To wit, I feel the EPA has failed to do an adequate job in preparing the Desert Rock Draft Air permit considering all important and relevant factors. I feel the EPA should wait to evaluate this permit until the Environmental Impact Statement has been released for comment by the citizens affected by this project. Indeed, I feel it is reckless and irresponsible to do otherwise. How can the anyone, even the EPA, make an assessment about the environmental impact of a project for which there has been no environmental impact information released? This whole situation is several lawsuits just waiting to happen. As a citizen of San</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>Juan County, as a business owner and resident of Farmington NM, and as a Citizen of the United States, I feel it is imperative to the health and livelihood of myself, my family, and my neighbors to take action against the very Un-American way the Desert Rock Draft Air permit is being dealt with. It is simply wrong that the EPA has failed to consider the impact of the 18000 (and growing) gas and oil wells already located in this neighborhood and how the air of this region will be affected when we add ANOTHER power plant. On a personal level, it is wrong that having moved here with no pre-existing respiratory problem, I have now a persistant daily cough after living here only 10 months. This no less, being a physically fit non smoker, who migrated here from the chronically polluted air of downtown Chicago. How is it that our little hamlet of near 40,000 souls has worse air quality than a 7 million person metropolis like CHICAGO ?! It all makes me fear that the EPA has forgotten its mission, forgotten its constituents. Perhaps "forgot" to include the fact that we already have the largest single source of pollution in the U.S. in our backyard in the San Juan Generating facility? Every week I read editorial and letters from my neighbors in opposition to this new power plant. Is this not a country by the people, for the people? When will the leadership wake up and truly represent the people? Since when is America a place where the citizen has no say in what goes on in his or her neighborhood? Since when are the commercial interests of corporations worth more than the health and well being of my neighbors, your neighbors? Since when is the health of our citizens up for sale? This is not the America that U.S. Veterans have put our lives on the line for. Is this the America you see in your dreams? I implore you and your fellow citizens at the EPA to do the right thing. Wait to evaluate the permit until the Environmental Impact Statement is released to the public. Let America be truly the land of the free, let the people decide. Joseph R. Sykes Veteran [REDACTED] Farmington, NM 87401 P.S. I bet if we gave the solar industry a similar pile of tax breaks and loopholes, they could come up with a plan to replace Desert Rock's generating capacity, and NOT give my kids brain damage from mercury and countless other pollutants. Wanna bet?</p>
878	Bill Williams	<p>SUBJECT: Fw: Desert Rock Power Plant proposal TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 10/24/2006 07:23 AM ----- Jeffrey Robinson/R6/USEPA/US 10/23/2006 05:11 AM To Gerardo Rios/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Fw: Desert Rock Power Plant proposal I will send an e-mail to the sender and let him know that his comments were forwarded to EPA Region 9 for consideration. ----- Forwarded by Jeffrey Robinson/R6/USEPA/US on 10/23/2006 07:06 AM -----Tuesday 10/17/2006 at 08:45 PM Name: Bill Williams E-Mail Address: [REDACTED] Category: 6PD : Subject: Desert Rock Power Plant proposal Message: To Whom It May Concern: This comment is in regard to the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant in northwest New Mexico. As a resident of Montezuma County in southwest Colorado, we are the regular recipients of pollution from the EXISTING power plants in the Farmington, NM area. I have lived here since 1981 and the visible air pollution continues to increase, visibility decreases and air quality obviously has declined. We used to see air pollution from the San Juan Basin only in the winter; now we see it all year long. The EPA recently announced that air quality in the Four Corners area has improved and is actually cleaner than it's been in a long time. If this is ACTUALLY the case, which is hard to believe, then the continued improvement of the air quality, especially in light of Mesa Verde National Park in Colorado needing pristine quality of air, then the EPA should ABSOLUTELY NOT site this new power plant in an effort to maintain and</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>continue to improve the air quality of this area. If the technology of this proposed plant is going to produce such little pollution, then the states that actually receive this power, which does not include Colorado or New Mexico, should be clamoring to have this plant placed in their states. The exportation of pollution from other states requiring more energy should NOT be allowed. If these plants are so clean, they should be located in the states of need. As long as the federal government does not require CONSERVATION efforts by industry, business and citizens, more and more of these proposed power plants will be required and they will continue to degrade the environment. It is requested that there be no acceptance for the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant due to the environmental impact it will have on air quality. Thank you.</p> <p>Assigned To: Assigned Date: Edit History: 06/10/20 10:04 AM Edited by Teresa Cooks - Category: 6PD 06/10/17 09:45 PM Created by Anonymous - Category: 6EN-P2</p>
879	Roberta Wood	<p>SUBJECT: Fw: epa open comments TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 10/24/2006 11:58 AM ----- Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US 10/24/2006 11:50 AM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Fw: epa open comments Another comment that references desert rock. ----- Forwarded by Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US on 10/24/2006 11:49 AM ----- "Wood, Roberta" 10/24/2006 09:29 AM To Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject epa open comments Dear Ms. Rosen: Please start using the new measuring system for measuring the chemicals in our air. Measure the coal. I love to go trout fishing and have for most of my life. Since our moving to Farmington, N.M. in March of 2004, I have not experienced the trout fishing below Navajo Dam in the San Juan River. I have not experienced the trout fishing further down stream from the Quality Waters. In fact, I haven't been fishing in New Mexico period. Why? One reason is we (my husband and I) don't have the time to go out of the Four Corners area to go fishing. We are just too busy. The other reason is simple. The fish in this area are full of mercury and I don't want it to kill me. Eating trout caught in the Four Corners region is scary business, and I don't want to get sick and die. The mercury in the fish is abnormally high. The sulfur and other chemicals in the air and water in this region is enough to kill plants and animals. How can I be expected to breathe the air here, or drink the water here, much less go fishing and eat contaminated fish? Do you really think I am that stupid? Do the power plants really think I am that ignorant? Well, here is a news flash for you and them: I do not want another power plant in the area. I realize the need is great, but I just don't want it. Sure, 90 percent of the bad emissions would be gone with the new stuff they use, but I am sick and tired of power plants going up in this area for the energy to be used elsewhere (like Arizona). If they want the energy, let them build it in their state, on their land, in their air. Quit contaminating mine and making me and our children sick. Make sure you start using the new measuring system for measuring the chemicals in our air. And, why are you measuring the air in Rio Rancho, instead of RIGHT HERE? Rio Rancho is about 3 hours away, what does their air have anything to do with ours? How dumb is that? Measure the coal. AND MEASURE IT HERE! THANK YOU. Roberta Wood [REDACTED] Farmington, NM 87401</p>
880	Jacob Hottell	<p>SUBJECT: Fw: Clean air TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 10/20/2006 01:23 PM ----- Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US 10/20/2006 10:54 AM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Fw: Clean air ----- Forwarded by Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US on 10/20/2006 10:53 AM ----- JK Chair</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>09/12/2006 08:36 PM To Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc julie_arvidson@nmenv.state.nm.us, barbara_claire@nmenv.state.nm.us, stephen@santafefineart.com, sgonzales@acrnet.com, horizonrtcd@hotmail.com, hottell2@hotmail.com, eaglesnest@cyberport.com, Geoff@msminerals.com, boxford@outerbounds.net, evert@cyberport.com, bill_papich@nm.blm.gov, jrees@acrnet.com, stephanie_stringer@nmenv.state.nm.us Subject Clean air Good evening, It appears that those of us who have been to endless public hearings and participated in many EIS evaluations and supplements to EIS documents do not have a right to clean water and clean air. The more bureaucracy red tape I see the more I realize it is simply a means to defuse the public. The air and water will be sacrificed so the wealthy can become even more wealthy! I am Jacob Hottell. I was the chairman of The Clean Water Coalition for over 15 years. Years ago we asked the New Mexico Health department for an accumulate impact study to see just how polluted our air and water have become. They could not justify the study. We have asked the EPA for an accumulate impact study to find out just how polluted our air has become. As of this date it has not been done. For some reason no one in the bureaucracy is concerned just how much of our air and water has already been sacrificed for the already wealthy of our society. We now have two power plants, refineries, pumping stations, thousands of compressors, stripper plants and considerable auto emissions that are emitting thousands of tons of NOX, CO2, CO, Sulfur dioxide and tons of other gases into the Four Corners atmosphere. We have the Animas LaPlata Project coming on line soon which will sacrifice considerable flow rates of the Animas River. I am sure the EPA is concerned about these intended concentrated flow rates. The more polluted the air becomes the more toxic load our snow melt and rain will be required to carry. We are now asking the EPA again for an accumulate impact study so the citizens of this area can know just how polluted our air and water already are. Please let us know what we need to do to participate in yet another EPA" study". Thanks Jacob Hottell [REDACTED]</p>
881	Joseph R. Sykes	<p>SUBJECT: Fw: Desert Rock Permit Questions TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 10/25/2006 10:46 AM ----- Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US 10/25/2006 10:24 AM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Fw: Desert Rock Permit Questions ----- Forwarded by Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US on 10/25/2006 10:24 AM ----- MarketingGoodAfterMorning 10/25/2006 10:23 AM Please respond to MarketingGoodAfterMorning To Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Desert Rock Permit Questions Ms. Rosen, Some questions. Given the documented health advisories in the region for Mercury, how does the EPA plan on complying with the Clean Air Mercury Rule (2005) to permanently limit and reduce mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants?? How are mercury advisories affecting Navajo Lake, McPhee Reservoir, the San Juan River, and Vallecito Lake.? Given that ozone levels in the Farmington, New Mexico area may soon exceed ozone limits and that NO2 and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) are a necessary component in the formation of ozone, how will Desert Rock affect ozone levels in the Four Corners region? Given the growing consensus about global warming caused by carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions, and the likelihood that CO2 will be regulated in the near future, how can EPA ignore the vast contribution (up to 13.7 million tons per year of CO2) to global warming caused by Desert Rock? What will occur to visibility in Class I areas like Mesa Verde National Park and Weminuche Wilderness? What mitigation plans are the EPA considering with Federal Land Managers from</p>

Number		Notes
		nearby national parks and national forest lands?? Does the Draft PSD Permit take into account non-stationary air quality effects (including projected fugitive dust) associated with the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant?? How are the non-stationary and stationary air quality impacts of the Desert Rock Power Plant evaluated cumulatively?? Joseph R. Sykes Veteran, [REDACTED]. Farmington, NM 87401
882	Larry Kerr	SUBJECT: Fw: EPA clean air hearings in Four Corners TEXT/COMMENTS: --- -- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 10/20/2006 01:23 PM ----- Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US 10/20/2006 10:54 AM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Fw: EPA clean air hearings in Four Corners ----- Forwarded by Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US on 10/20/2006 10:54 AM ----- Larry Kerr 10/06/2006 12:16 PM To Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Linda Kerr Subject EPA clean air hearings in Four Corners Mrs. Rosen: I was not able to attend the public meeting October 5 to voice my concerns about clean air in the Four Corners area. I am a registered republican and a conservative on most issues. However, I do not believe the EPA or the power companies are doing an adequate job to protect the health of homeowners in the area near these power plants. My wife and I own a farm at 3705 West Highway 64 in Waterflow, NM, which is situated almost dead center between the APS and PNM power plants here. Each day, we see the scuzz pumped out of those plants during the night and I'm certain it is not as well treated as the emissions released during the daylight hours. More importantly, I am also certain that the air quality is not adequately monitored for mercury content because research done by my technical writing students at San Juan College indicates the closest monitoring stations are nearly a hundred miles north of us. That's pathetic! The danger is right here in the fallout zone. Now, the power industry wants to put in the Desert Rock plant thirty miles south of Farmington. Given the prevailing wind direction, the emissions from that plant will be combined with the emissions from the APS plant and drift directly over my home every single day. I'm 53-years-old, so I'm not too concerned if I die of poisoning, cancer, or a heart attack. However, I have a 15-year-old daughter who is an outstanding student and athlete at Kirtland Central High School. I would like for her to live a normal life and produce healthy children, too. I'm not sure that will happen if the power companies are not held accountable for the crap they are releasing in the air we breath. Larry Kerr [REDACTED] Kirtland, NM 87417
883	Tina Edwards	SUBJECT: TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 10/27/2006 02:43 PM ----- Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US 10/27/2006 02:41 PM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject ----- Forwarded by Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US on 10/27/2006 02:41 PM ----- "Edwards, Tina" 10/27/2006 12:32 PM To Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject After reading about a recent meeting concerning the Four Corners Power Plant and another proposed plant southwest of Farmington, I felt that I needed to send you my comment. The air over our beautiful area is dirty and ugly. You can almost always see it on the horizon, and can't help but wonder how it is affecting your life expectancy. I know that we are few in population compared to other areas, but that doesn't mean that the health of the people here is less important than people who live elsewhere. I realize that plants for energy are needed, but they should not threaten the well-being of the people who live here. Is there not another solution? Thank you. Tina Edwards (Aztec, New Mexico) NOTICE - This message and any attached files may contain information that is confidential and/or subject of legal privilege intended only for

Number		Notes
		use by the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this message in error and that any dissemination, copying or use of this message or attachment is strictly forbidden, as is the disclosure of the information therein. If you have received this message in error please notify the sender immediately and delete the message.
884	Judy Johnson	<p>SUBJECT: Fw: Air Quality Comment San Juan County NM</p> <p>TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 11/07/2006 10:52 AM ----- Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US 11/07/2006 10:40 AM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Fw: Air Quality Comment San Juan County NM ----- Forwarded by Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US on 11/07/2006 10:39 AM ----- Judy Johnson 11/07/2006 09:40 AM To Rebecca Rosen/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Air Quality Comment San Juan County NM I would like to add my concerns to the public comment record concerning the Air Quality Permitting process for the Desert Rock Power Plant. As a resident of Farmington, NM the degradation of air quality has been visible over the last 15 years I have lived here. I would request that the most stringent air quality standards be applied to the power plants already operating in the area, and that if Desert Rock is approved that it's approval would be on the condition that there is no net gain in CO2, SO2 and mercury emissions to the area. Thank you for accepting this comment. Judy Johnson Business Manager Johnson Mapping and Surveying, LLC [REDACTED]</p>
885	Jay Weishel	<p>SUBJECT: Fw: 4 Corners Power plant</p> <p>TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 10/17/2006 07:18 AM ----- Jay Weishel 10/15/2006 09:17 AM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject 4 Corners Power plant Dear Sir, My name is Jay Weishel and I have lived in the 4 corners area for 34 years. I remember when this area was touted for having the cleanest air in the country, a computer enhanced 225 mi. visibility as I recall. That is one of the reasons I live here, but unfortunately that is no longer the case, the air quality has definitely deteriorated. If you are to take a flight in the local area in the morning it is very obvious as to where the pollutants are coming from evidenced by the greenish /yellow haze that hangs about the 4 corners area. Several years ago there was a report in the paper that the only man made pollutants visible from space were emanating from the 4 corner plants. Recently Lake Vallecito, east of Durango, CO., had warnings posted against eating bass and other large game fish because of high mercury levels. I believe there is a direct link in this contamination from the 2 existing coal fired power generating plants at Shiprock and the one at the west end of Lake Powell. Sir, I am gravely concerned when I read in the paper that the head of the EPA states that the air in the 4 corners area can support more pollution when referring to the proposed new coal fired power plant on the Navahoe nation. I find it incredible that such a statement can even be made. I realize that new technology can make this plant cleaner, however with the reports of accelerated melting of tundra areas of the planet, an unpredicted 10 fold release of the methane gases, I strongly urge The EPA to deny the construction of the new proposed 4 corners power plant. Sincerely, Jay Weishel Ignacio, CO.</p>
886	Karlene Stange	<p>SUBJECT: Fw: Desert Rock</p> <p>TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 08/02/2006 07:44 AM ----- Robin and Karlene 07/14/2006 07:22 AM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>Desert Rock Dear Mr. Baker; The oxygen molecules in your body have been here for eons, circulating in other life forms, like pterydactlys and woolly mammoths. Each time I breathe in fumes from a smelly truck I remind myself of where those fossil fuel hydrocarbons used to be. Now they are in me...but they make me cough. We know that mercury, sulfur, and other molecules emitted from the burning of fossil fuels is harmful for us to breathe. We know they cause diseases. Yes, we want our refridgerators to run. But, we want to open them and eat healthy foods...not mercury containing fish. We want to produce energy, and it can be expensive, but so is health care. It seems more efficient to prevent the cause of disease. This brings me to you. You are in the position to protect my health, and your own. This atmosphere we live in is shared by all. The winds do not stop but travel around the globe. You can influence the future of all human health. We all need the proposed Desert Rock owners to see past the dollars they make and look at the potential cost of the damage the plant's emissions will cause. Please, insist on a public hearing near Durango, Colorado. Please, help us keep our air healthy. Our lives depend on this atmosphere; it is here to stay, long after humans are gone. Thanks you for doing the best job you can, Karlene Stange</p>
887	Bradley Angel	<p>SUBJECT: Fw: request for notification of public comment opportunities on proposed Desert Rock power plant TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 08/01/2006 04:05 PM ----- Bradley Angel 07/28/2006 09:33 AM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Lily Lee/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc "'Anna M. Frazier" , 'Lori Goodman' Subject request for notification of public comment opportunities on proposed Desert Rock power plant Please notify me of any and all opportunities for public comments on the proposed Desert Rock power plant. Please also note that Greenaction joins tribal members in requesting that a public hearing be held in the immediate vicinity of the community targeted by this polluting project, not just in Shiprock. As the US EPA is supposedly committed to environmental justice, a failure to hold a public hearing in the targeted community for such a giant proposed project is a clear violation of environmental justice. Also thanks for agreeing to email me the draft permit, which US EPA unfortunately issued for this polluting project that should never be approved. Please send notice via email and US mail to me at the following address: bradley@greenaction.org Bradley Angel Executive Director Greenaction for Health and Environmental Justice One Hallidie Plaza, Suite 760 San Francisco, CA 94102</p>
888	Linda Bunk	<p>SUBJECT: Fw: please hold a hearing in Durango TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 08/01/2006 11:11 AM ----- Linda & Ron Bunk 07/31/2006 12:43 PM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject please hold a hearing in Durango Hello Bob, it is my understanding that the only public hearing on EPA's proposal to grant an air quality permit for another coal burning power plant in Shiprock will be held in Shiprock on 8/17. Southwest Colorado and the rest of the Four Corners is already inundated with the pollution from the current power plants and it is a reasonable request that a public meeting be held closer to our homes. Please add additional hearings so the voice of those down-wind can be heard. I just returned from a backpack trip in the Lizard Head Wilderness Area. Each night there was significant rain to clean the air yet each morning we could clearly see the pollution caused by the current power plants - it was enough to make me cry. I cannot afford to drive to Shiprock - please consider this letter as my statement. Better yet, hold a meeting in a closer location so people like myself may have an opportunity to speak. Sincerely, Linda Bunk</p>

Num ber		Notes
889	Linda Newberry	SUBJECT: Fw: Desert Rock TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 07/24/2006 02:02 PM ----- Linda Newberry 07/24/2006 12:58 PM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Desert Rock Hello Mr. Baker, After reading two articles in the Durango Herald about the proposed Desert Rock power plant, I felt I had to write to you. I live with my family in Bayfield, CO, east of Durango. There are days when the sky is very "dirty" from power plants and other conditions south of us in New Mexico. As a person who has suffered asthma, I do not want anymore air pollution to occur where I live. I urge you to make the process more open and EPA and the power plant owners more accountable. It is hard to believe it when they say in the paper, "really, this will be built up to the highest standards," when we all know that those standards have been seriously compromised in the last few years. Please do the right thing, and protect the community from poor planning, and air pollution. Thank you in advance. Linda Newberry Environmental Resources Specialist [REDACTED] Durango, CO 81302 [REDACTED]
890	Shawna Off	SUBJECT: Fw: Coal Burning Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 08/02/2006 10:11 AM ----- Shawna Off 08/02/2006 09:10 AM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Coal Burning Power Plant Hi Robert.....I am writing about the building of another Coal Burning Power Plant in northern New Mexico. Is it true that the the EPA plans to hold just one public hearing on its proposal to grant an air quality permit for the new power plant and that it will be in Shiprock on 8/17? Air quality has taken a dive in the 25 years I have lived in Durango. I was in the mountains off of Lizard Head pass this past weekend and I could see a distinct darker, brownish yellowish layer above the horizon. I do not remember seeing this in the first 10 or 15 years of residence here. As a living and breathing person in Durango, I have an increasing concern about air quality. I insist that the epa recognize the downwind impacts of coal burning power plants and hold a public hearing in Durango or Southwest Colorado. Thank you for your time, Shawna Off
891	Laurie E. Dickson	SUBJECT: Fw: Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 08/02/2006 03:03 PM ----- Laurie Dickson 08/02/2006 02:47 PM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Power Plant Dear Mr. Baker; I have been a resident of Durango for 17 years. The air quality of this beautiful town has noticeably decreased in that time and it's distressing to know another power plant will add to the degradation. I hope that you are planning and will give adequate notice to the residents here for hearings related to the Desert Rock Project. At a time when global warming, droughts in the SW and water levels that don't support another huge demand such as is required by coal fired plants, constructing another plant seems unbelievable. Please let us know the schedule of hearings so that those of us who will be significantly impacted can be heard. Thank you, Laurie E. Dickson Eco Home Center,LLC Sustainable Building Supplies, Healthy Home Decor Laurie E. Dickson 3101 Main Ave., Suite 2 Durango, CO 81301 PH.970-259-8-ECO FX.970-259-8327 www.ecohomecenter.com
892	Seth Furtney	SUBJECT: Fw: Proposed Desert Rock Power Station TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 08/02/2006 07:42 AM ----- Seth Furtney 07/14/2006 12:02 PM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Proposed Desert Rock Power Station Mr. Baker, As a citizen of Durango, Colorado I am not confident that a thorough evaluation of the Desert Rock Power Plant is taking place. According to some contact I have in town I

Num ber		Notes
		am of the understanding that the environmental review is based on data provided to the environmental firm by the proposing firm and that several of the studies are not complete...and that nonetheless the marching orders are to find no fault with the proposed station. As a down-wind resident, I am concerned that the air and lakes in my community are almost certain to be directly and negatively affected by this plant, but that these negative impacts are given little to no consideration. I strongly recommend that a public hearing for this plant be held in Durango to consider our concerns. Seth Furtney [REDACTED] Durango, CO 81301 [REDACTED]
893	Cheri St. Denis	SUBJECT: Fw: Desert Rock TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 08/01/2006 11:10 AM ----- "Cheri St. Denis" 07/31/2006 02:47 PM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Desert Rock Dear Mr. Baker: What I have been learning about the Desert Rock project is very concerning to me because of the proximity my family and I live to the location on the proposed project. I strongly urge you to insist that the EPA recognize the downwind impacts of coal burning power plants and hold a public hearing in Durango or Southwest Colorado. As our global climate is changing before our eyes we should be especially wary about the effects these coal burning power plants are having on our environment and be stricter about the pollution control. We need to insist that the cleanest technology be used, not overlooked. Please be aware of everyone concerned. Thank you, Cheri St. Denis
894	Kent Ford	SUBJECT: Fw: Southwest Colorado is downwind of Desert Rock TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 08/02/2006 10:07 AM ----- Kent Ford 08/02/2006 09:54 AM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Southwest Colorado is downwind of Desert Rock Robert Baker EPA Southwest Colorado is downwind of proposed Desert Rock. Enough said, we should have a public hearing in our area. Our air quality is on a downward spiral in recent years! Kent Ford [REDACTED] Durango CO 81301 Kent Ford [REDACTED] www.performancevideo.com
895	Tracy Daniels	SUBJECT: Fw: Desert Rock Power plant TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 08/02/2006 07:45 AM ----- Tracy Recht 07/13/2006 09:09 AM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Desert Rock Power plant I hope that you will consider the downwind impacts of coal-burning power plants. Please don't allow the air quaility of the Four Corners region to get even worse. There is brilliant technology these days, maybe expensive but that protects the earth and the people on it. Please make the public process more open and accountable. Thank you for your time. Tracy Daniels Durango, CO Do You Yahoo!? Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around http://mail.yahoo.com
896	Dr. Faron Scott	SUBJECT: Fw: Desert Rock TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 10/24/2006 07:46 AM ----- "Scott, Faron" 10/23/2006 04:20 PM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Desert Rock I'm sending this quick note to let you know that I am against granting a permit for Desert Rock. I know that some people suggest that mercury and other emissions would not be harmful, but frankly, I don't put a lot of stock in what people say when they also are for the project. I mean, I live in this area, my lakes are polluted, as are the rivers around here, due to years of human pollution--not just coal burning. Thank you for your consideration. Dr. Faron Scott Fort Lewis College Durango, CO 81301 [REDACTED]
897	Cindy Dunbar	SUBJECT: Fw: Desert Rock TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 08/07/2006 07:22 AM ----- Dunbar/Deighan

Num ber		Notes
	Kevin Deighan	08/07/2006 06:01 AM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Desert Rock Mr. Baker: I am writing to encourage a public meeting in Durango, Colorado concerning the effects of the proposed Desert Rock coal fired plant. We are more than just nosey neighbors to the proposed plant. As you are probably aware, the prevailing winds and weather patterns generally flow from the south and west for the four corners region. Although, we are a bit north we are downwinders. Please include us in the public meetings. Sincerely, Cindy Dunbar Kevin Deighan [REDACTED] Durango Colorado 81301
898	Luann Andrew	SUBJECT: Fw: coal fired plants TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 08/02/2006 12:17 PM ----- Luann Andrew 08/02/2006 11:14 AM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject coal fired plants Hey, You need to give the folks in SW Colorado a chance and a closer venue to express feelongs about air quality and coal fired plants in NM. It directly affects us in Durango, and we should have a say in this. More public hearings closer to us, please. Luann Andrew [REDACTED] Durango, CO 81301
899	Dave Rich	SUBJECT: Fw: Desert Rock power plant TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 08/02/2006 07:44 AM ----- Dave Rich 07/13/2006 04:01 PM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Desert Rock power plant Please hold a public hearing in Durango, Colorado regarding the proposed Desert Rock power plant. We are downwind. Thank you. Dave Rich
900	joann farley	SUBJECT: Fw: meeting in Durango TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 08/02/2006 10:06 AM ----- joann farley 08/02/2006 09:29 AM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject meeting in Durango do what you have to , put my name and e-mail on the list for a meeting in Durango thanks Joann Farley
901	sarah wright	SUBJECT: Fw: Durango mtg. TEXT/COMMENTS: ----- Forwarded by Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US on 08/02/2006 03:02 PM ----- sarah wright 08/02/2006 02:40 PM To Robert Baker/R9/USEPA/US@EPA cc Subject Durango mtg. Please schedule a durango mtg. we have a strong interest in this! September would be great.
902	Ron Chacey	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: I am very concerned that Sithe Global Energy is proposing to build the 1500-megawatt Desert Rock coal-fired power plant near where I live! This plant will contribute to global warming and pollute the surrounding air quality with mercury, sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen oxides. Given that the San Juan Generating Station and Four Corners Power Plant are well documented as two of the major polluting power plants in the U.S., why does the EPA consider the adjacent siting of Desert Rock appropriate, and what are the answers to the following emissions related questions? What about SOx, CO and NOx emissions? I am asking you, EPA, to recite, specifically, the methodology used for the air quality modeling. Why were monitors in Farmington, New Mexico and Rio Rancho, New Mexico used for background concentrations of pollutants in the modeling for Desert Rock, rather than local monitors near the project site south of Shiprock? What was done in the modeling to analyze cumulative air quality impacts? Given the documented health advisories in the region for Mercury, how does the EPA plan on complying with the Clean Air Mercury Rule (2005) to permanently limit and reduce mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants? How are mercury advisories affecting Navajo Lake, McPhee Reservoir, the San Juan River, and Vallecito Lake? Given that ozone levels in the Farmington, New Mexico area may soon exceed ozone limits and that nitrogen oxides are a necessary component in the formation of ozone, how will Desert Rock affect ozone levels

Number		Notes
		<p>in the Four Corners region? Given the growing consensus about global warming caused by carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions, and the likelihood that CO2 will be regulated in the near future, how can EPA ignore the vast contribution to global warming caused by Desert Rock? Why is the EPA allowing the high concentration of power plants in the Four Corners region degrading public health and quality of life? What will occur to visibility in Class I areas like Mesa Verde National Park and Weminuche Wilderness? Does the Draft Air Permit take into account non-stationary air quality effects (including projected fugitive dust) associated with the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant? How are the non-stationary and stationary air quality impacts of the Desert Rock Power Plant evaluated cumulatively? Given that Desert Rock is located in an area with a high percentage of low-income minority residents, how can Desert Rock not impact Environmental Justice? How does Desert Rock comply with Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations." Compliance with Environmental Justice is required for the Air Quality permit, where issues of concern include, "Disproportionate exposure to pollutants, potential health problems (respiratory, heavy metals in fish)." Desert Rock appears to be on a fast track, so how can we possibly have a valid and legal EIS/Draft Air Quality Permit and modeling? How can the Draft Air Quality Permit be evaluated when the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the entire project has yet to be released? Why does the comment period for the air quality permit close (October 27, 2006) before the Draft EIS is released to the public later this year? How does the public know that the entire proposed Desert Rock project and associated infrastructure is incorporated and evaluated in the proposed Air Quality Permit? Where will the power generated by Desert Rock be transmitted to and what will be the associated air quality impacts? Has the proper modeling been applied to the analysis of Desert Rock? What is the background monitoring data for the Desert Rock project, such as for ammonia, and how is it applied to the PSD permit in the analysis of Best Available Control Technology? Ron Chacey [REDACTED] Phone and FAX - [REDACTED], Pagosa Sp., CO 81147</p>
903	William Christensen	<p>SUBJECT: power plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Please do not destroy our air any further. I can't even eat the fish here any more because of all the mercury in the water..... William Christensen [REDACTED]</p>
904	Sarah Eastin	<p>SUBJECT: citizen comments; Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Greetings- I am writing to comment on the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant. I was born and raised in Southwest Colorado and I now currently reside outside of Durango. I am an asthmatic. I am very concerned about the quality of air not only for myself but for residents of these communities and future generations. My asthmatic condition has been a major concern in my life for many years, I feel that I have an increased difficulty breathing because of the already poor air quality. Furthermore, I have found it extremely hard to find health coverage because of my preexisting condition, it has also has been quite a financial burden. I do not want to see additional children and future generations burdened with these problems. I feel that if the Desert Rock is granted a permit to allow construction of the facility the health and quality of life for many of my neighbors will suffer. I am also concerned about impacts water quality, wildlife, the environment, and the potential emissions contribution to Global Climate Change. I think it is a huge mistake to issue permits before the EIS is completed. I believe that many issues have not been addressed and the proper research has not been conducted to make proper management decisions. I urge you to postpone issuance of the permit. In return for</p>

Num ber		Notes
		<p>permitting the development of Desert Rock, I suggest that you require the existing power plants to reduce their emissions to where the sum of all three power plant emissions would be what the existing power plants put out today. I feel that by doing some sort of project like this you could benefit the Tribe and the financial interests, as well as protect the environment and the health of my community. Thank you for your consideration, Sarah Eastin Biologist [REDACTED] Hesperus, Co 81326 [REDACTED] Try the next generation of search with Windows LiveT Search today! Try it now!</p>
905	Sarah Payne	<p>SUBJECT: EPA Region 8 TEXT/COMMENTS: I am writing to notify you that I am oposed to EPA Region 8's proposed permit for a new coal-fired power plant in northern New Mexico. I strongly believe we need to develop new, clean energy resources and refrain from using coal as a fuel. Energy conservation is lacking in our society, and the rejection of this permit would send a stong message about embracing the reduction of waste and spending our electricity dollars on new, clean technology. Should you have any questions regarding this statement, please feel free to reply to this message. Thank you for considering my message. Sincerely, Sarah Payne Concerned citizen living in Montezuma Valley Use your PC to make calls at very low rates https://voiceoam.pcs.v2s.live.com/partnerredirect.aspx</p>
906	Rebecca and Tony O'Gorman	<p>SUBJECT: Re: Desert Rock Energy Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Hi, Ed: Thanks for the info. We always go to the website first but didn't want to take a chance on missing this meeting as we will be out-of-town in the interim. We are supporters of the project. Thanks again, Rebecca and Tony O'Gorman From: DesertRockAirPermit@epamail.epa.gov To: Side Canyon CC: DesertRockAirPermit@epamail.epa.gov Subject: Re: Desert Rock Energy Plant Date: Wed, 23 Aug 2006 13:16:14 -0700 Hi- Here is the Shiprock Public Hearing information from our website. Thanks for your interest in this project. I encourage you to check our website for project and public meeting updates. http://www.epa.gov/region09/air/permit/desertrock/index.html -Ed</p>
907	Curt & Anne Swanson	<p>SUBJECT: Proposed Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: My husband and I are retired and live in Bayfield, CO. We are extremely concerned about the prospect of ANOTHER coal-fired power plant so close to this pristine area. Given that the two existing power plants (San Juan Generating Station and Four Corners Power Plant) are two of the worst polluters in the entire country, why should we feel confident that the EPA will impose strict environmental controls on a new power plant? You should first require the other two plants to clean up their act! We are adamantly opposed to the construction of the Desert Rock power plant. Curt & Anne Swanson [REDACTED] Bayfield, CO 81122</p>
908	Scott Moore	<p>SUBJECT: permit for Sithe Global air pollution TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Sir/Madam, I would like to make the following comments regarding the proposed power plant (Desert Rock Power) to be built by Sithe Global in New Mexico on the Navajo Nation. 1. I and my family live in Durango, CO and we already suffer from the poor air quality and do not want any further air quality diminishment. Specifically, over the years we have noticed the smog and poor visibility in our remote corner of the world. No longer do we enjoy expansive views when looking down from the LaPlata Mountains; instead we see yellow haze from the existing coal power plants and increasing oil & gas development. Another power plant – regardless of how improved the cleaning technology – will only worsen our air. 2. This part of the world depends on visitors and tourists who come here to enjoy what they believe is unspoiled wilderness areas, however, the poor air quality will surely affect the numbers of people</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>willing to travel to the Four Corners area. 3. My daughters both suffer from allergies and asthma, which worsen with the poorer air quality. This gigantic power plant's emissions will only exacerbate their conditions. 4. We are so concerned with the air quality that we are considering leaving this part of the United States and moving to an area with cleaner air, but we feel that some area of the world ought to be treated with special care – and an area such as where this power plant is proposed is one such area. The prevailing winds blow the particulates eastward over the Durango – SW Colorado region and we must breathe the pollutants. The poorer air accounts for worsened health, costly health consequences, less tourism, worse standard of life. This part of the United States is special because it is home to some of the largest wilderness areas in the country and the worsening air quality will jeopardize animal and fish life and well as the quality of visits to such places. Thank you for considering our input. Scott Moore [REDACTED] Durango, CO 81301</p>
909	Stephen Wells	<p>SUBJECT: Permit comment TEXT/COMMENTS: Please accept this email as my objection to the building of Desert Rock Power Plant. The proposed Desert Rock Power Plant would be the third coal fired power plant located within the Four Corners Region. My understanding is that the two existing power plants in the area are two of the worst sources of pollution for this area and are some of the worst polluters of that type in the country. I am unclear as to whether or not these existing plants are able to pollute to the extent they do because of the lack of restrictions placed upon them by the Navajo Nation, the EPA or some other agency, however, I find the level of current pollution unacceptable. Clearly, an additional coal fired plant in this area, regardless of the amount of pollutants that it releases into our air, is also unacceptable. I believe it is tragic, sad, unhealthy, ridiculous and a serious black eye for the EPA that we must regulate the amount of fish we eat from our local lakes due to the amount of mercury pollution that is being spewed by these power plants. This should be one of the least polluted areas of the country, yet, we cannot eat the fish from lakes and we must learn to live with the black cloud that hangs over the area. The damage done to national treasures such as Mesa Verde should be sufficient to deny the Desert Rock application, however, global warming also comes to mind as a national concern. Please do not add to already polluted air of this region by approving an additional polluter. Stephen Wells [REDACTED] Durango, CO 81301</p>
910	SueEllen Campbell	<p>SUBJECT: new power plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear EPA officials: I've just learned about the plan to build yet another coal-fired power plant on the Navajo Reservation near Farmington and am writing to express my dismay. I've been visiting the Four Corners area for some forty years now, most recently to visit a brother who lives in Cortez, and have been unhappy to watch the clarity of the air there decrease with the two current dirty plants. I've been thinking about retiring near Cortez and, as a person with asthma, would have to seriously re-think if the air got even dirtier. This is, as obviously the moneyed interests behind power companies know, a place where the inhabitants don't have the power to fight effectively for effective and enforced regulations. The EPA needs therefore to be especially vigilant. Sincerely, SueEllen Campbell Bellvue, Colorado</p>
911	Sujan Bryan	<p>SUBJECT: coal powered? TEXT/COMMENTS: To whom it may concern: I'd like to add my voice to the many voices concerned about the construction of the Sithe power plant. The bottom-line is that coal-powered power plants are extremely polluting, not only by producing unsafe levels of particulate pollution, but also through the effects of a lack of genuine effort to reduce other</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>production and waste contaminants. I have read numerous documents for and against coal-produced-power, done extensive research on particulate pollution and its causes, listened to lectures by EPA officials on the subject of regional power plants, and studied federal guidelines versus medical guidelines for safe particulate levels (including the National Jewish Center's material). It is crystal clear that coal, a non-renewable resource (yes, there is LOTS of it), is an unnecessarily detrimental resource. I don't need to cite specific statistics since I know that the EPA is aware of them. I simply wish to include my voice in opposition of a coal-powered power plant, especially when there are cleaner, do-able options. My health and the health of the animals and people I care about are at stake. Sincerely, Sujan Bryan Sujan Bryan Web Graphics Specialist Publications Department Crow Canyon Archaeological Center 23390 Rd K, Cortez, CO 81321 ph - 970-565-8975 fx - 970-565-4859 http://www.crowcanyon.org email - sbryan@crowcanyon.org</p>
912	susie and daniel	<p>SUBJECT: Desert rock power plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear E.P.A, I am concerned about the new Desert Rock plant for several reasons. 1. There is no guarantee of mercury monitoring paid by Sithe. Mercury is already such a problem that we are warned by Fish and Game to not eat at all or severely limit our consumption of fish caught in McPhee. 2. The new power plant does not use BACT which would be Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle but the more polluting and less efficient supercritical pulverized coal fired boilers.. 3. EPA has not considered air quality data now available from the Mesa Verde monitoring site and Sithe's agreement to protect Mesa Verde as a Class One area exists only in a side agreement which is not legally enforceable. If EPA people really think that we have clean air, then you need to come visit. There is often a yellow haze in the distance in the vicinity of the existing coal fired plants. Asthma sufferers pay the price both here in Colorado and on the Navajo reservation. I realize that the Sithe plant is going to be a lot cleaner than the existing plants which are terrible polluters, but you need to ensure that it is the least polluting and most efficient in the nation. Then you really need to do something to insist the plants that already exist here clean up their collective act. Sincerely, Susan Localio Dolores, CO</p>
913	tad johnson	<p>SUBJECT: Four Corners Resident Feedback from Tad Johnson TEXT/COMMENTS: Please require the most complete emissions control and testing possible. Please fine the operators serious money if emissions exceed acceptable levels. Please provide many, many positive benefits to the people most directly affected by the plant. Tad Johnson Hesperus, CO</p>
914	David Kuntz	<p>SUBJECT: permit comment TEXT/COMMENTS: October 3, 2006 Dear Mr. Baker: I am writing to express my opinion on the ongoing permit process for the proposed new Desert Rock Power Plant. I am a resident of the 4corners area in Colorado. Since I have lived here I have had the opportunity to travel throughout the region for over 30 years. I have always noted the existence of low elevation brown clouds of emissions from the existing Four Corners power plant and the other large power plant on the Navajo reservation, these brown emissions are usually at higher elevations, but often are now found at ground level. My concerns are numerous and passionate regarding the increasing occasions of air pollution that we find throughout the region. This new power plant will obviously increase these incidences and will do irreparable harm to the surrounding mountains with forests that are already recording record levels of acid rain and air particulates. I live in an area that is dependent on its scenic values to sustain our tourist economy. This is our livelihood and the impacts of another local power plant, no matter how state of the art, will undoubtedly</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>increase the likelihood of negatively impacting the health of our citizens and visitors. I challenge you to demand a reevaluation of the impacts that will be incurred when this new plant is operating. I believe there are numerous laws that are in place that would protect our communities that have wilderness areas, national parks and other inherent historic, recreational and scenic values that will be impacted severely with this new project. How can you, as a representative of the EPA, allow an obvious degradation to take place for the benefit of only economic growth? We should be looking at how we can enact policy and action that will sustain us and our children and not compromise our health and well being for some short sighted policies that do nothing but ignore our responsibilities to our environment and our world. Ignoring the path of degradation leaves you and all of us at risk. Thank you for your careful reflection on this issue. Please reply to David Kuntz, [REDACTED], Telluride, Co, 81435, or email to [REDACTED]. Sincerely, David Kuntz</p>
915	Wesley Kay	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Mr/Mrs/Ms I am writing you to let you know that I am strongly opposed to the proposition of building a new power plant 25 miles south of Farmington. The most awful thing is your apparent disregard for the environment. It would be inconcievalbe to me if you do not know that this type of pollution that the Four Corners and San Juan Generating power plants cannot be continued if you, and me, and our families, and loved ones wish to live. Pollution is killing us and the planet we live on, and as humans we must do all we can to protect our natural state of being. Thank you for your time. Wesley Kay</p>
916	Ted Mueller	<p>SUBJECT: permit requirements TEXT/COMMENTS: Desert Rock Emissions Monitoring Set-up The present proposed monitoring permit requirements address only measurement of permit standards while there is another category of monitoring which could and should be done. This category would be data needed or useful for the evaluation of mitigation options in the present or the future. PROPOSED ADDITIONAL MONITORING a. PM2.5 continuous monitoring requirement. The 4 Corners region has several class 1 areas and a long term requirement by the EPA for improving visibility. PM2.5 is a critical element in this problem and future mitigation of it will require precise knowledge of the relative contributions from multiple and varied sources. This could come about by inclusion in the EPA permit conditions or by the company adding it to what they are doing to protect themselves from future finger pointing. Either way the data needs to be publicly available so those evaluating mitigation options have the use of it. b. Speciated Hg stack emission plus a plume contact measurement. This region now has several lakes where restrictions of fishing exist because of Hg levels in the fish. The sources of Hg are multiple (geology, mining, oil & gas, agriculture, and power plants) to devise a proper mitigation plan the Hg species will need to be known so that sources can be identified and contribution determined. Models which predict Hg species in the environment from those found in the stack have shown problems. (Hg Speciation in Coal-fired Power Plant Plumes Observed at Three Surface Sites in the SE U.S., Environ. Sci. Technol.2006, 40, 4563-4570:Modeling Hg in Power Plant Plumes, Environ. Sci. Technol,2006, 40,3848-3854) For this reason sampling at plume ground contact needs to be done to determine species for our environment and plant and coal types as the Hg enters the environment since we can not count on modeling to give correct Hg speciation. The stack sampling should be required under the permit plume surface contact samples however might be a cooperative venture between state or tribal personal and the company. (State or Tribal personnel taking the sample and this sample then run by the company with the stack sample.) c.</p>

Number		Notes
		<p>VOC sampling in addition to that presently specified in the permit. While the VOC's are nowhere near levels that would cause general health problems they are critical to the processes involved in the visibility problem which needs addressing. VOC's react in the plume after emission and change. A measurement of the VOC's after the initial reaction in the plume would be advantageous since it would give what is present to react to give the visibility problems. The VOC's present after this initial reaction is usually predicted by modeling however the literature indicates there are some problems with this approach. Measurements made at the plume ground contact could be a joint operation. State or Tribal personnel might collect a sample with the company running the sample with their stack sample.</p>
917	Teri Teller	<p>SUBJECT: impact of the power plants TEXT/COMMENTS: The people who have a conscience, I have lived in the Four Corners my whole life and have seen changes for the worst since my childhood. I have seen the ugly brown smog getting darker and spreading across further into the skies of other states. I have lost family members in this area to cancer of the breast, stomach and colon. I strongly believe that it is due to the air, food, and local animals we live off of. My great grandmother and grandmother have seen horrible changes to the Indigenous Dine population in their lifetimes. They have seen the gas pumps pollute the Chuska mountains and the horrible damage the uranium mines have done to the Dine. Now, two more power plants invading this area where the quality of the air is just as bad as congested cities from the two power plants already in place. I am sure people at the EPA have some sense and heart to make sure not to have corporations build in an area that does not have many plants and trees to take in the the pollution. I beg of you, PLEASE, do not let these power plants pass and become a devastating reality! I am crying and pleading with you all, please do not hurt Mother Earth more than she is already hurting! My ancestors, children, and future generations plead for healthier living. Is it not enough to have raped, pillaged, and slaughtered a nation inhabited with people who truly loved this Earth for what it was and not what could be taken and destroyed?! \$50 million or more is not worth the lives of all who will die from these murderous plants. A daughter of Mother Earth and Father Sky, Teri Nuhn (Red Valley, AZ, Dine Reservation) Teri</p>
918	Thomas Berry	<p>SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Good Morning I am writing to express my opposition to the Desert Rock power plant. I have several reasons: 1. I do not believe that the plant has considered all of the available technology for coal fired plants in regards to pollution control. 2. I do not believe that the air quality at Mesa Verda National Park has been factored into the overall air quality assessment. 3. I object to the EPA issuing a Clean Air Act Prevention of Significant Deterioration permit before the Environmental Impact Analysis is released. This seems like the permit will be issued no matter the EIS findings. 4. I object to the EPA using side agreements rather than a legally enforceable permit. 5. I do not see any provision for independent monitoring, paid by the plant, to insure that environmental issues are in fact checked and promises kept. In short - please do not issue your CAPSD until the facts are known and sufficient safeguards are in place. I live here and do not want my air quality compromised. Thank you for your attention to this matter, Thomas P. Berry AIA Thomas P. Berry BERRY FACILITY DEVELOPMENT LLC P. O. Box 3149 Durango, Colorado 81302-3149 Phone 970-259-4951 Fax 970-259-4954 Mobile 970-769-0178 Web Page www.berryfacility.com Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may</p>

Number		Notes
		contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original Message.
919	THOMAS H MILLER	SUBJECT: New Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear Mr. Baker: I never suffered from asthma until my husband and I moved to Farmington, NM, 12 years ago. Now I use Abluterol and Advair in order to breathe. I can see the yellowish green cloud in the sky and have driven through Waterflow when the smog was so bad it affected visibility while driving and I could taste the sulphur in the air. We are being poisoned by the poor air quality. Clean power is a must. The coal burning power plants, especially the ones without scrubbers must be shut down or cleaned up. The area will not survive another one. Roberta Summers
920	Tim Kearns	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Air Permit TEXT/COMMENTS: Dear EPA: This is in regard to the proposed permit for the Desert Rock coal-fired power plant in northwest New Mexico. The proposed Desert Rock air permit should not be issued until the current air standard quality in the Four Corners region has been addressed and improved. Despite misleading statements by representatives of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the two coal powered generating stations in the Four Corners region have created a situation where the air quality is detrimental to the health and welfare of the local population and fall-out of mercury from the poorly regulated plants has contaminated local watersheds. Any addition to the current situation will only further endanger the health and lives of the inhabitants of the region. For decades, the EPA has ignored the health and well being of the local population in favor of the monetary bottom line of the owners of the two polluting power plants. Why should the local population believe that anything has changed and that more stringent regulations will be imposed on the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant? Because of two coal-fired power plants and the significant increase in gas and oil development, the air quality in the Four Corners Region is dangerous; any increase in airborne particulates and chemicals from another coal-fired power plant will negatively impact the health and lives of the citizens of the region. This should not be allowed to happen. Sincerely, Timothy M. Kearns
921	Tim Schaldach	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant comment TEXT/COMMENTS: If you want to protect the air in the Four Corners area (and everywhere downwind), you should deny all appropriate permits. Then you should suggest to Sithe Global Energy that they go back to the drawing board and put together plans for a photo-voltaic solar plant. A zero-emission facility would surely breeze through the entire permitting process and would have the blessing of all stakeholders. Let's be forward-looking and push for progressive solutions to our power needs. Tim Schaldach Durango, CO
922	Tom & Diane Higgins	SUBJECT: Proposed Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: Sirs: The EPA has a legal duty to do just what its name says--protect the environment. The EPA's current proposal for the Desert Rock Power Plant does not protect our environment. On the contrary, the EPA's proposal will further degrade our air quality in the Four Corners. The EPA is also mandated to provide the highest degree of protection of air quality in Class 1 areas, which includes Mesa Verde National Park. The only way this power plant can be built with the EPA following its legal duty and mandates is to insist on an integrated-gasification-combined-cycle design. Please insist on it. I am quite distressed at the obvious EPA actions supporting corporations and industry goals at the

Number		Notes
		expense of the health of the environment and the public. This is wrong. Please put integrity back into your department. Thank you for hearing my comments. Sincerely, Diane K. Higgins, [REDACTED] Durango, CO 81301
923	Tom King	SUBJECT: comment TEXT/COMMENTS: I support the building of the Desert Rock power plant. Tom King King Energy Services, Inc. 1715 B E. Broadway St. Farmington, NM 87401 Ph: 505-325-5374 Fax: 505-325-5376
924	Tracy Murphy	SUBJECT: Desert Rock comment TEXT/COMMENTS: Thank you for your thoughtful consideration my comments regarding the proposed Desert Rock coal-fired power plant. While touting a clean-burning, most-technologically advanced power plant, Sithe Global will have the opportunity to trade pollution credits to the other facilities in the area with no net reduction in air pollutants, so it is not going to get better for our mountain-desert environment. Will there be pollution credit trade? If so, how will this be handled to protect environmental quality and protect the health and welfare of our communities? The two existing power plants in San Juan County burn their coal primarily at night so we don't see it, thus the morning haze. I would require that Sithe Global only burn during the day, so people become more aware of the impact that our energy use causes, rather than hide the real impacts. How is the EPA looking at more than air borne pollutants? How is the EPA considering what happens when air pollutants falls to the ground in precipitation or particulate matter on land or water? How will more than air quality be protected? I would like to know how the EPA and plant operators will address and regulate mercury emissions from this plant? The Bush Admin. removed mercury from Clean Air Act permitting, so EPA cannot legally regulate mercury under this permitting process. Most of our lakes in this area have fish consumption advisories for methyl mercury. This power plant WILL produce mercury via coal burning. Will mercury be regulated voluntarily or under some other mechanism? Or will the pollution to our water shed and habitat be allowed to continue unchecked? Fishing and local fish consumption in the Dolores River/McPhee reservoir region and in NW New Mexico does have a positive economic impact on our communities, but continuing to allow mercury to be released into the air, end up in our lakes and convert to methyl mercury is a negative impact to our economy and health. The process for determining how much more pollution of various sorts the air can handle is a very complex modeling scheme. Lots of errors occur along the way. The people who do the modeling do not live here and they do not see the haze. The "dispersion modeling" is insufficient to determine the impacts on local and regional air quality. How will this modeling be addressed and rectified? Thank you, Tracy Murphy [REDACTED], CO 81323 [REDACTED]
925	Tracy Recht	SUBJECT: Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: I have a number of questions and comments about the proposed Desert Rock Coal Fired Power Plant. With our Nations current issues with global warming and environmental degradation, we look to you to make good decisions about our future and for our future generations. We have far too many innovative and progressive technologies to continue to build power plants that only hurt our environment and human health. Please take a moment to read my questions and if possible give some answers to them. At least my questions could raise awareness and point out that this power plant is a very bad idea for the 21st century. Given that the San Juan Generating Station and Four Corners Power Plant are well documented as two of the major polluting power plants in the U.S., why does the EPA consider the adjacent siting of Desert Rock appropriate? The coal mining (Navajo Mine), coal delivery systems and existing power plants

Number		Notes
		<p>represent a massive complex already. Please recite, specifically, the methodology used for the air quality modeling. Why were monitors in Farmington, New Mexico and Rio Rancho, New Mexico used for background concentrations of pollutants in the modeling for Desert Rock, rather than local monitors near the project site ? What was done in the modeling to analyze cumulative air quality impacts? Note the following statement from the New Mexico Environment Department/Air Quality Bureau (AQB) in 2002 in response to the question "Can the AQB monitor near the Navajo Nation? " Answer: "AQB used to have a site called "Reservation" that was located on the Navajo Reservation, approximately 1 mile NNW of the APS Four Corners power plant and 5 miles SW of the PNM San Juan power plant, where it measured sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and nitrogen oxides (NO₂) concentrations. That site was shut down in 1994 because of vandalism and because tribal authorities took over responsibility for that area. A monitoring site outside of Shiprock, which measured SO₂ and PM₁₀, was closed in 1998. When they were in operation, these sites did not show very high values of the pollutants they were measuring." Therefore, there are no monitors near the proposed Desert Rock project site. Given the documented health advisories in the region for Mercury, how does the EPA plan on complying with the Clean Air Mercury Rule (2005) to permanently limit and reduce mercury emissions from coal-fired power plants? Ask the EPA how mercury advisories are affecting Navajo Lake, McPhee Reservoir, the San Juan River, and Vallecito Lake. Given that ozone levels in the Farmington, New Mexico area may soon exceed ozone limits and that NO₂ and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) are a necessary component in the formation of ozone, how will Desert Rock affect ozone levels in the Four Corners region? Given the growing consensus about global warming caused by carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions, and the likelihood that CO₂ will be regulated in the near future, how can EPA ignore the vast contribution (up to 13.7 million tons per year of CO₂) to global warming caused by Desert Rock? What will occur to visibility in Class I areas like Mesa Verde National Park and Weminuche Wilderness? What mitigation plans are the EPA considering with Federal Land Managers from nearby national parks and national forest lands? Does the Draft PSD Permit take into account non-stationary air quality effects (including projected fugitive dust) associated with the proposed Desert Rock Power Plant? How are the non-stationary and stationary air quality impacts of the Desert Rock Power Plant evaluated cumulatively? How does Draft PSD permit for Desert Rock comply with Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations." Compliance with Environmental Justice is required for the Draft PSD permit, where issues of concern include, "Disproportionate exposure to pollutants, potential health problems (respiratory, heavy metals in fish)." EIS/Draft Air Quality Permit How can the Draft PSD Permit be evaluated when the Draft EIS for the entire project has yet to be released? How does the public know that the entire proposed Desert Rock project and associated infrastructure is incorporated and evaluated in the proposed PSD permit? Where will the power generated by Desert Rock be transmitted to and what will be the associated air quality impacts? Modeling For the PSD permit, EPA has utilized the Calpuff model to determine the proposed Desert Rock facility on air quality. The Draft PSD permit requires total pollution levels to be determined by adding the impacts from the proposed Desert Rock project to the total levels of pollution expected from all other existing sources combined. The EPA is required to have a accurate assessment of NO₂ and VOCs for the Draft PSD permit. This total pollution, presumably, should include a complete inventory of</p>

Number		Notes
		all major and minor sources in the Four Corners region including all natural gas and coal facilities (including Southern Ute tribal land; Navajo Nation land; Jicarilla Apache land; BLM and Forest Service land in Colorado, Utah and New Mexico). Do You Yahoo!? Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around http://mail.yahoo.com
926	Mark Williams	SUBJECT: Fwd: new power plant Desert Rock TEXT/COMMENTS: Begin forwarded message: > From: turnip60@mindspring.com > Date: October 7, 2006 10:56:02 AM PDT > To: desertrockairpermit@epagov > Subject: new power plant Desert Rock > Robert Baker, > Dear Sir, > it is with great disappointment that i have been reading about a new > coal fired power plant being built south of Farmington. I am building > a small house outside of Durango CO and one of the reason I chose that > area was because of the perception of clean air and pristine natural > beauty. Just recently I have read about the high levels of mercury in > local lakes and rivers. Obviously due to existing power plants in NM > and AZ. In building my house i plan on doing my part for future energy > needs by installing solar panels to reduce my consumption. The fact > that with all the information out there right now about global warming > and mercury contamination and with the main culprits being coal fired > power plants that there is a plan to build a new one is downright > irresponsible. The EPA needs to step up it's responsibility to protect > the majority of the people and start thinking long term about the > effects these decisions are having. please do the right thing and not > allow a new source of irreversible contamination be built at the cost > of the health of our people ... > Sincerely, > Mark Williams
927	Lau Ackerman	SUBJECT: Please Stop the Building of Desert Rock Power Plant TEXT/COMMENTS: I can not believe that there is an idea of approving a power plant in the Farmington/Shiprock area. This area is already a pollution nightmare and will become worse with the approval of another power plant. Contrary to comments, we can not reverse existing pollution and even the best power plants still create pollution. I would hope that a study of the area and the power plant would make everyone aware of the existing and future air, land and water pollution. The skies around the Four Corners can not stand more power plant pollution. The people of the Four Corners area do not deserve to be sickened by more pollution. As I grew up in the Four Corners area, visit often, and hope to move back someday, I can tell you how much I disagree with the approval of the Desert Rock Power Plant. Please Do Not let this power plant be built. Lau Ackerman [REDACTED] Chico, CA 95928 Formerly of: [REDACTED] Ignacio, CO 81137